U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

CMP-SPRCM-76-33

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

NOVEMBER 1976

U.S.
U.I.C.C.
JAN 10 1977
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

https://archive.org/details/selections-from-prc-magazines_1976-11_33

中华人民共和国杂志选译

CMP-SPRCM-76-33

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 896
November 2, 1976

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

(Historical Research)

The Great Change in Lu Hsün's World View - by Chang Cho 1

The Social Economy of the Ch'in Shih Huang Era - by Ts'ao Yung-nien & Meng Kuang-yao 24

We Certainly Cannot Take the Same Road as Those Who Try To Abolish Class Struggle 35

TABLE OF CONTENTS: Historical Research No. 2, April 20, 1976 49

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

* * *

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

The Great Change in Lu Hsün's World View

by

Chang Cho (张琢)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 3, June 20, 1976)

"The chief commander of China's cultural revolution, Lu Hsün was not only a great man of letters but a great thinker and revolutionary." The great change in Lu Hsün's world outlook from his earlier revolutionary democratic views to communism in the latter part of his life was a huge political and ideological leap in his whole fighting life.

I

At the time of Lu Hsün's birth, both class and national contradictions were extraordinarily acute and violent owing to the corrupt feudal rule of the Ch'ing government and invasion by foreign capitalist powers, and they in turn aggravated the contradictions and strife within the ruling class itself. These two kinds of struggle made a direct impact on the feudal family into which Lu Hsün was born. They led Lu Hsün to a "heretical path" from his young days and initiated his ideological "change."

In the article "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship" Chairman Mao spoke of the search by Chinese progressives for truth from abroad to save the nation and the people from the 1840's to the early 20th century. He said: "From the time of China's defeat in the Opium War of 1840, Chinese progressives went through untold hardships in their quest for truth from the Western countries. Hung Hsiu-ch'üan, K'ang Yu-wei, Yen Fu and Sun Yat-sen were representative of those who had looked to the West for truth before the Communist Party of China was born. Chinese who then sought progress would read any book containing the new knowledge from the West. The number of students sent to Japan, Britain, the United States, France and Germany was amazing. At home, the imperial examinations were abolished and modern schools sprang up like bamboo shoots after a spring rain; every effort was made to learn from the West.... They represented the culture of Western bourgeois democracy, including the social theories and natural sciences of that period, and they were called 'the new learning' in contrast to Chinese feudal culture, which was called 'the old learning.' .... Only modernization could save China, only learning from foreign countries could modernize China. Among the foreign countries, only the Western capitalist countries were then progressive, as they had successfully built modern bourgeois states. The Japanese had been successful in learning from the West, and the Chinese also wished to learn from the Japanese." In 1898, when the 18-year-old Lu Hsün arrived at Nanking in his search for a new path, he too read these new things avidly. It was at this time that Yen Fu's translation of Huxley's Theory of Evolution, an important work that advocated Darwinism, was published. Lu Hsün was one of the first and most ardent readers of this book, which produced a profound and far-reaching influence on his thought. Later, he wrote in Japan a thesis, "History of

Man," which was mainly an exposition of Science of Genesis of Mankind by the German biologist Haeckel, successor to Darwin's theory. The thesis presented Darwin's theory of evolution of living things and the history of its development.

In dealing with Darwin's theory of evolution, as in dealing with other new scientific theories, people invariably started from two radically different stands and viewpoints as soon as the interests of opposing classes were involved, and this led to two opposite lines and two opposite conclusions. The teachers of proletarian revolution made the theory the scientific world outlook of the proletariat--the "natural-historical basis" of dialectics and historical materialism. (Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXX, p. 131) On the other hand, reactionary bourgeois scholars distorted and exploited it, produced a vulgar theory of evolution and social Darwinism, obliterated classes and class struggle, denied revolutionary changes of society, opposed the proletarian revolution, distorted social history with "struggle for existence" and with "triumph of the superior over the inferior." They defended the gangster logic of "feeding of the strong on the weak" which justified the brutal plunder of colonies by the capitalist powers and the oppression and exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie.

In China, the situation was no different. Yen Fu, being the first to translate and introduce Darwin's theory of evolution, produced quite a tremendous influence on thinkers of the time and contributed to the history of modern Chinese thought. Yet later he too followed the reformist road of vulgar evolutionism and sank from active advocacy of reform and modernization into support for "Ch'ou An Hui" which favored Yüan Shih-k'ai's ascension to the throne. As to Hu Shih, a bourgeois Rightist who wormed his way to the May 4 movement and later became a running dog of the imperialists and Kuomintang reactionaries, he used vulgar evolutionism as a weapon to oppose Marxism and advocated "reform bit by bit" in opposition to the revolution. His reactionary nature needs no explanation. To Lu Hsün at the other end, Darwin's theory of evolution became the direct natural-scientific basis for his early materialistic view of nature and revolutionary view of historical evolution, and when Lu Hsün's view of social history leaped to Marxist historical materialism, it became an important part of the natural-scientific basis of his scientific world outlook of dialectical and historical materialism.

In his quest of truth to save the nation and the people, Lu Hsün left Nanking in 1902 to study in Japan. When Lu Hsün arrived in Japan, this capitalist late-comer also completed its phase of ascent and entered the general reactionary phase of imperialism. Originally, Lu Hsün "went to Japan because he despaired of Confucius and his disciples." (Chieh-chieht'ing Miscellaneous Essays, Part 2: Confucius in Modern China) In Japan, however, what he heard and saw was still worship of Confucius. The imperialists used the departed spirit of Confucius to serve their decadent rule and the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius as a "soft knife" to continue to fetter the minds of the Chinese people and subjugate China, and thus caused utmost resentment in Lu Hsün. During his study in Japan,

moreover, the Russo-Japanese war broke out. The two imperialist powers waged a savage war on Chinese soil, making the Chinese people and territory objects of slaughter and trampling, while physically healthy and strong Chinese, still unawakened, "could only serve as stuff for meaningless public demonstration and spectators." This grave national crisis deeply shocked Lu Hsün. Originally Lu Hsün went to Japan to study medicine with the illusion of national salvation through science, one of his objects being to promote "the faith of his fellow countrymen in modernization." Now he realized "the thing of prime importance was to change their spirit, and the best way to do so, I thought at that time, was literature and art. So I wanted to promote a literature and art movement." ("Slogan Shouts: Author's Preface") Thus Lu Hsün embarked on the battlefield of ideological revolution. This was no accident, but "a powerful current flowing from natural science to social science" (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XX, p. 189) formed in response to the urgent needs of China and the world as a result of the steadily aggravating social contradictions. So, like Sun Yat-sen and some of his contemporaries who were advanced personalities, Lu Hsün changed course from natural science to social science and went to the fighting line of political revolution. At the time bourgeois revolutionaries headed by Sun Yat-sen were actively carrying out revolutionary activities in Japan and engaged in a massive polemic with the reformists over "revolution or reform." In the midst of this great polemic and division among Chinese thinkers, Lu Hsün became a thoroughgoing revolutionary democrat from thought to action.

Giving up the scalpel for dissection of the human body and leaving the operating theater, Lu Hsün entered the arena of social revolution and, picking up the pen that dissects man's soul, began a new battle. Although at that time he was not yet able to analyze "man" from the class viewpoint, nor was he able to find out the economic causes that determined man's social consciousness, his concern was the awakening of the masses of people and his desire was to change their social consciousness. Man, in reality, was no longer viewed in purely biological meaning. Although this did not go beyond the scope of historical idealism, it marked Lu Hsün's advance in the direction of historical materialism on his way to knowledge of social history and of man's social essence.

In his early days Lu Hsün wrote some papers on natural science and the history of science. These writings show that Lu Hsün already absorbed much of the newest scientific achievements attained at the time by the capitalist countries and that his knowledge of physics, chemistry, biology, geology, medicine and other areas already reached quite a high level. For example, five years after the discovery of radium, an important discovery of natural science at the turn of the 20th century, and one year after the extraction of pure radium and initial determination of its atomic weight, Lu Hsün wrote a monograph "On Radium" and introduced it to China before others. The discovery of radium proved the divisibility of the atom and the mutual transformation of chemical elements, thus exploding the old idea that the atom was indivisible and elements were unchangeable. At that time, taking advantage of the metaphysical weakness of the old mechanical materialist theory, some reactionary bourgeois idealist

philosophers in the West loudly clamored that the discovery of radium and other related scientific discoveries brought about a "crisis in physics," and declared that "the atom has vanished" and "matter has vanished." Lu Hsün, on the other hand, was able to take the dialectical viewpoint of evolutionary development and jubilantly praised the discovery of radium as "the light of dawn of a new century that shatters the dream of old-fashioned scholars." Summing up a series of discoveries in natural sciences at that time, Lu Hsün said: "The study of X-rays gives us radium rays. The study of radium rays produces the theory of electrons. Hence the idea about matter, suddenly shocked, undergoes a great change. People, subdued, discard the old to make room for the new. As the rotten fruit falls, a new blossom opens." Engels said: "Even following every epoch-making discovery in the realm of natural science, materialism inevitably changes its own form." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 224) The new scientific discoveries such as radium, electrons, transformation of elements, etc. were indeed a big shock to the old concept of matter in metaphysical mechanical materialism, but they precisely provided the dialectical-materialist view of matter with the newest and valid scientific proof. As Lenin said: "The latest discoveries of natural science -- radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements -- have remarkably confirmed Marx's dialectical materialism, despite the teachings of the bourgeois philosophers with their 'new' reversions to old and rotten idealism." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. II, p. 442) Lu Hsün's understanding of the profound and far-reaching significance of these scientific discoveries and his idea of "discarding the old to make room for the new" showed that his materialist view of development already broke through the confines of the metaphysical theory of vulgar evolutionism and mechanical materialist concept of matter.

Such materialistic, dialectical view of development was likewise patently embodied in his other essays of that time. In "The Strength of Mahabbarata," he wrote explicitly: Things are developing and the world is on the march; evolution is like a flying arrow that will never fly back and return to the bowstring. This enabled him, in his later revolutionary journey, to always maintain the conviction that "mankind is all the time progressing.... There may be prohibitions and proscriptions, but progress will always be made" ("The Canopy: This and That"), regardless of how dark it was at present and how forces of reaction undermined the forces of revolution and proscribed progressive thought. Lu Hsün not only pointed out that things always developed forward, "from a low to a higher level and from being simple to complex" ("Omissions: Brief Discussion on China's Geology"), but further affirmed that the way of evolutionary development was not straight, but wave-like, in a spiral, and that this was a law universally applicable to nature, society, and human knowledge. "It is therefore said that the world does not advance in a straight line, but often in spirals with big and small waves rising and falling in a multitude of ways, that after going forward and backward it will reach the water's edge. How true that is! Moreover, this is true not only of knowledge and ethics, but also of science and arts." ("The Tomb: Lessons in History of Science") Motion is absolute and development is infinite and endless, "proceeding daily from a low to a higher plane without hitch."

("The Tomb: History of Man") Everything is in constant motion, changing and developing, and nothing stands absolutely still. The same is true of society. "Peace does not exist in the world. What is arbitrarily called peace is only a state just at the conclusion of war or before it starts. Beneath things which appear quiet and peaceful lies an undercurrent which, when the time comes, will begin to move." ("The Tomb: The Strength of Mahabbarata") Later Lu Hsün further pointed out: the cause of this evolutionary development lies inside things ("inner effort") ("The Tomb: How Should We Do Fathering Now"), thus drawing a line of demarcation with the theory of external causation in vulgar evolutionism which denies internal causation.

Recognition of the objective reality of matter in motion is the premise of the materialist theory of reflection. The material world exists objectively, and man's subjective knowledge is a reflection of the objective world. Hence Lu Hsün said that the fact of evolutionary development of the objective world "was evolutionism authored by Nature, and Darwin plagiarized it and produced a great work of the 19th century." ("Omissions: Brief Discussion on China's Geology") Darwin's theory of evolution was merely a "plagiarism" or copy of the evolution of nature itself. On the basis of the materialist theory of reflection, Lu Hsün strove hard to unify dialectically perceptual knowledge with rational knowledge. He highly appraised the distinguished English materialist Bacon for stressing the function of perceptual experience and induction. He described Bacon's epistemology as "initially from experience to a universally accepted view (i.e., a theorem) and then from that view to new experience." However, Lu Hsün also attached great importance to the function of rational knowledge and deduction emphasized by the French rationalist Descartes. Moreover, he pointed out the one-sidedness and limitations of the two for "inclining to one side," and favored the combination of the two. "Truth can be made clear if both methods are used. The progress of science today actually owes to the use of these two methods." ("The Tomb: Lessons in History of Science")

Taking the stand of a thoroughgoing revolutionary democrat, Lu Hsün observed society with an evolutionist view which had the character of dialectical development assimilated from the theory of evolution, and formed his revolutionary concept of historical evolution.

Starting from his revolutionary concept of historical evolution, Lu Hsün exposed and criticized the reactionary essence of the Westerning school and reformists. Particularly he vehemently attacked those who stuck to their reactionary concept of history as represented by the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius, a concept which reverted to ancient practices and the old order. He pointed out that their "mind is focused far away on the time of emperors Yao and Shun, or goes directly to early antiquity and wanders in an age when men and animals lived together. They say that in those days there was no evil and people were content with their lot, quite unlike the present era where evils and dangers abound and people find it hard to live." In fact, the struggle and labor of the ancients surpassed

those of the present day in brutality and hardship. "Their view is contrary to the facts as recorded in the history of evolution of mankind. Owing to their multiplication, the ancient people had to migrate. Their struggles and drudgery could not have been less severe, if not more so, than those of the moderns." Lu Hsün lashed out at this preposterous view which lauded the ancients and discredited the moderns, calling it the view of worms and beasts "which would rather go to sleep and degenerate than seek improvement." ("The Tomb: The Strength of Mahabbarata")

It should be pointed out that in Lu Hsün's early world outlook, what played the decisive role was first of all the national democratic revolutionary stand determined by the objective existence of class and national struggles, and not Darwin's theory. It was the needs of this revolutionary struggle that led him to make his demands on the theory and determined his attitude of adoption or rejection of it and the extent of its application. "Taken over" by Lu Hsün, Darwin's theory of evolution became a theoretical weapon in his hand. But it was not the only weapon, nor was it simply taken over and allowed to limit his scope; he transformed it. As Lu Hsün lived in a colonial and semi-colonial society and took the stand of the oppressed nation and people, he was opposed to the social Darwinists who defended imperialist aggression and exploitation. He lashed out at the so-called "patriotism" which sang the praises of aggressive acts by the strong against the weak, calling it "beast love" and the aggressor who "under the excuse of the evolutionism of survival of the fittest, satisfies his ambition by attacking the small and weak" as "bestial patriot." ("The Tomb: The Strength of Mahabbarata") Contrary to such patriots, he made the idea of "struggle for existence" an ideological weapon with which to inspire the oppressed and enslaved people of the motherland to rise up and fight resolutely for their own salvation. "From now on there should be sharp blades and tough shields to protect ourselves, so as to prevent giant boars and reptiles from devouring us. But this is only for self-defense, not to invade others as aggressors do." ("Omissions: Breaking the Voice of Evil") Obviously this played an active, fighting role at that time. As for the theory of "struggle for existence," we should not interpret it in an abstract manner, but must observe and evaluate it in the context of the concrete historical environment of a given time. What Lu Hsün meant by "struggle for existence" is to protect the existence of the weak, the oppressed people and nations, to fight against the strong, the oppressors and aggressors. Herein lies "righteous valor and justice" which must not be confused with reactionary social Darwinism. In his life Lu Hsün constantly, ruthlessly lashed out with the utmost wrath at those scoundrels "who assume the appearance of sheep when they encounter beasts fiercer than they are, and become fierce beasts when they encounter sheep." ("The Canopy: Passing Thoughts") When evaluating the English democratic poet Byron, Lu Hsün fervently sang the praises of what was actually his own spirit of helping the weak against the strong. He said: "Self-respectful but compassionate to those who were slaves, subduing others but helpful to those fighting for independence, he had no fear of raging storms but was wary on horseback; warlike and worshipful of strength, he was relentless against enemies but sympathetic to suffering prisoners." ("The Tomb: The Strength of Mahabbarata") This

may be said to be the embryo of his later great communist spirit: "Fierce-browed, I coolly defy a thousand pointing fingers; head-bowed, like a willing ox I serve the children."

Beginning from the May 4 movement, China's bourgeois democratic revolution developed from the old democratic revolution to the new democratic revolution. By that time political leadership of China's bourgeois democratic revolution no longer belonged to the bourgeoisie, but to the proletariat, and its guiding thought was the communist outlook on the universe and social revolution of the proletariat. This made the revolution more thoroughgoing as never before. The May 4 movement was a revolutionary movement that was thoroughly, uncompromisingly anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. Consciously greeting "the light of dawn of the new century" and voluntarily obeying "the order of the vanguard of revolution" of the proletariat, Lu Hsün plunged into a new battle.

During the May 4 period, Lu Hsün, starting from the viewpoint of evolution, reasoned that "there must be a metabolic process on the way of evolution. So what is new should joyfully march forward to adulthood, and the old should also joyfully march forward to death. When everything goes forward in this way, there will be evolution." ("Hot Wind: Random Thoughts, 49") But there is no such joyful civility in reality. In a class society in particular, none of the reactionary, decadent things will fall unless you hit them. Metabolism involves a life-and-death struggle, in which no one can go forward "joyfully in his own way." In Lu Hsün's later words, it was only "an illusion of mine." Of course, Lu Hsün the realist never really based his action on the illusion that the old forces would voluntarily make their exit in favor of new forces. On the contrary, he long ago made up his mind to "offer my blood to Hsüan Yüan /Yellow Emperor/." When he, as a thoroughly revolutionary democrat, began to introduce to Chinese readers Western authors with bourgeois revolutionary democratic ideas and their works, he had "already decided to resist." He entered the arena of the May 4 new cultural movement as a "fierce pathbreaker" who would tear the feudal dragnet apart. He called for utterly smashing the old world; he wanted to sweep away the man-eaters, end the banquet of human flesh and destroy the kitchen. Knowing the old dark forces only too well, he realized that these reactionary dark forces could not be overthrown without "violent struggle" and one must "trample on the iron thorns to go forward." He was an exponent of the unity of revolution and evolution, regarding revolution as the life of evolution. He said that only with revolution "can society reform and mankind progress. From primitive creatures to man, from savagery to civilization, this has been possible because revolution has gone on without a moment's interruption." ("That's That: Literature in the Revolutionary Era") The history of mankind is a "history in which man has advanced amid bloody fighting."

While Lu Hsün was still a revolutionary democrat, he naturally was still unable to know the masses of people correctly and essentially from the viewpoint of Marxism. Yet he focussed his attention exactly on the masses of people. In "The Road of Life," Lu Hsün wrote: The new road "is beaten out where none existed before, in a place of brambles." But who was to beat it

out? Where lay the hope? It lay exactly in the millions and millions of the masses! It was with this hope that he shouted at the "slumbering" people in the "iron house." The characters in his stories, such as Jun T'u, Sister Hsiang Lin, and Ah Q, are images of oppressed and tormented peasants. By creating these images he critically reflected the profound lesson of the 1911 Revolution which failed owing to its separation from the people, in particular the great mass of peasants. As can be seen from his works at that time, restricted by the historical conditions of that time and his own world outlook, he was still unable to discover in its essence the immense revolutionary enthusiasm latent among the masses of people, and as a result, he focussed too much of his attention on the negative side of the masses -- their backwardness, apathy and selfishness, which led him to feel at times disappointment, frustration, emptiness and perplexity. But on the other hand, it was because the masses, led by the proletariat, were developing their struggle steadily and gradually showing their strength that he was able to devote his effort ceaselessly to demolishing that "miserable heavy barrier" separating him from Jun T'u, i.e., the working people, and to explore and bring to light the noble qualities of the working people and the immense revolutionary strength latent in them. Through "a small incident" he saw "the sudden lengthening of the shadow of the dust-covered" working people. ("Slogan Shouts: A Small Incident") This increased his courage and boosted his hopes. The unyielding, brave struggle of the revolutionary youngsters whose faces were covered with blood made him "seem to see the vague hopes" and increased his confidence in revolution and conviction that "men of true courage will march forward with still greater determination." ("Sequel to the Canopy: In Memory of Mr. Liu Ho-chen") This enabled him to identify himself increasingly with the revolutionary masses in stand, viewpoint and feeling, and he became a faithful mouthpiece of the masses of people as well as a courageous standard bearer of the new cultural army of the proletariat. He marched forward step by step, and by 1926, when his revolutionary democratic world outlook "changed" to the communist world outlook, Lu Hsün arrived at the historical materialist conclusion that "the world is formed of fools, and wise men can never support the world." ("The Tomb: Postscript to The Tomb") He believed that "the spirit of the nation alone is valuable and only when it is developed will China achieve real progress." ("Sequel to the Canopy: The Three Spirits of Academic Circles")

With constant deepening of his knowledge of the oppressed and exploited masses of people, Lu Hsün's knowledge of class antagonisms in society also became increasingly clear in the practice of struggle. In "Idle Chats in Late Spring," Lu Hsün vividly and profoundly showed, with the allegory of the narrow-waisted wasp and the small green insect, the cruel exploitation and spiritual drugging of the working people by the reactionary ruling class. In "Random Notes Under the Lamp," he showed that the whole history of China since it had a written language had been a history of exploitation and enslavement of the broad masses of working people. He saw that in this society "there are the noble and the lowly, the big and the small, the high and the low," that there were "all kinds of banquets with roast meat, shark's fin, ordinary food, Western food.

But there are also simple meals under the thatched roof, leftovers by the roadside, and starving men in the wilderness. There are men of enormous wealth who eat roast meat, and also starving children near death who are worth only 8 cents a catty." What a striking picture of class conflicts! "Government officials and the people," "the masters and the slaves"....occupied different positions. Accordingly "there are all kinds of luck, all kinds of mouths, all kinds of eyes." ("The Canopy: After Bumping Against the Wall") In practical struggle Lu Hsün already deeply sensed the existence of class antagonisms. Hence he said: "In the present day world, it is an idle dream to hope for impartial public opinion." ("Sequel to the Canopy: Random Notes on the Day the Kitchen God Was Sent Away") "Man does not communicate with his soul." ("Sequal to the Canopy: Flowerless Roses, II") It may be seen that even in his early works, although Lu Hsün had not yet applied the scientific concept of classes and class struggle, he nevertheless reflected with increasing depth the objective fact of class struggle.

Taking the stand of the masses of people, Lu Hsün fought to awaken them to strive for their own emancipation, and this infused into many of his views the character of historical materialism. In "Before There Was Genius" and other works, he forcefully refuted idealist transcendentalism and the view that history was made by heroes, and exposed the humbuggery of the doctrines of genius, inspiration, and other mystic nonsense, pointing out: "Genius is not a monster which is born and grows spontaneously in the deep jungles, but is produced and fostered by people capable of producing and fostering it. Without such people, there can be no genius." Hence the most important thing is to have people capable of extraordinarily hard work to serve as the soil for the growth of genius. Moreover, "the first cry of even a genius after birth is exactly like that of any other ordinary baby, and absolutely cannot be a good poem." He said that he himself had no "creative impulse" to write, that his writings had nothing to do with "inspiration" and the like, but were squeezed out of him. Marx did not write Capital in a burst of excitement after drinking several cups of coffee and smoking several cigarettes. After his change toward the Marxist world outlook, these precious ideological elements of his characteristic of dialectical and historical materialism were developed in greater depth under the guidance of the fundamental principles of the completely scientific dialectical and historical materialism. Even today these views of his are still an effective weapon for our criticism of idealist transcendentalism and the doctrine of genius trumpeted by such pseudo-Marxist political swindlers as Lin Piao and Ch'en Po-ta.

To sum up the above, as a revolutionary democrat in his early years, Lu Hsün's materialistic concept of nature was already grounded in dialectical materialism. It was superior to mechanical materialism and came very close to dialectical materialism, but it was not yet complete dialectical materialism united into one with historical materialism. His revolutionary concept of historical evolution already embodied many precious historical-materialist factors, but he did not as yet consciously interpret from the viewpoint of class struggle such evolutionary development of

history. Instead he speculated about social history from the logic of biological evolution that "the future will necessarily be better than the past, and youth is better than old age." Hence, basically speaking, he did not as yet free himself from the category of historical idealism, even though he already saw with increasing clarity the role of the masses of people in creating history and some of the obvious phenomena of class conflicts in society as well as gaining rich experience in respect to certain laws of class struggle, the essence of class enemies, the amalgamation and division of revolutionary forces, etc. "But what determines the motives of people, of the mass of people, that is, what gives rise to the clash of conflicting ideas and strivings; what is the sum total of all these clashes of the whole mass of human societies; what are the objective conditions of production of material life that forms the basis of all historical activity of man; what is the law of development of these conditions?" (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. II, p. 586) To seek further scientific answers to these questions, one has no alternative but to take the Marxist road. Through arduous "search," Lu Hsün finally found this road.

II

With the development of the revolution, education by living class struggle and steady deepening of his study of Marxist theory, Lu Hsün continually examined his own views, "remedied and rectified" them.

While summing up the experience of past revolutionary struggles, in particular the lessons drawn from the failure of the 1911 Revolution, Lu Hsün also summed up his own thoughts and strictly dissected himself. In 1926, while in Amoy he collected his past writings into a book which he entitled The Tomb, meant to be a summing-up of the past, or "burial" as he said in his "inscription." In his postscript, "Words Written at the End of The Tomb," he put his own thought in order through an even more ruthless self-analysis. This was the end to the old and the beginning for the new. In "Reply to Mr. Yu Heng," he admitted that "When I left Amoy, my thought had changed somewhat." Lu Hsün did not at that time elaborate on "the path of such change," but in "New Ways of Dealing With People" which he wrote toward the end of 1926, we can see signs of such ideological change. He wrote: "'The struggle for existence is a law of evolution' necessitates rejection of what is foreign in one's own circle. It is no wonder that 'one should take the place of the other,' be one old or young, because this is dictated by the times and the environment." This was no longer simply a law of natural evolution with "the young superior to the old," but a struggle for "rejection of what is foreign in one's own circle" determined by historical times and social circumstances. It was "one should take the place of the other" and not everyone "going forward joyfully in his own way" without mutual interference. However, this struggle for "rejection of what is foreign in one's own circle" was not yet elevated to the level of class struggle in human society, but still grudgingly carried the umbilical cord of the old evolutionary theory of "struggle for existence as the law of evolution," and the allegation about "the dictates of the times and circumstances" still struck one as being too vague. What, after all, determined the times and circumstances, and how

did they come about? "That in any given society the strivings of some of its members conflict with the strivings of others, that social life is full of contradictions, that history discloses a struggle between nations and societies as well as within nations and societies, and, in addition, an alternation of periods of revolution and reaction, peace and war, stagnation and rapid progress or decline -- are facts that are generally known. Marxism provided the clue which enables us to discover the laws governing this seeming labyrinth and chaos, namely, the theory of the class struggle.... And the source of the conflicting strivings lies in the difference in the position and mode of life of the classes into which each society is divided." (Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. II, pp. 586-587) While Lu Hsün was thinking hard about these perplexing problems, Marxism provided clear answers. In the course of earnestly summing up the experience of practical struggle, Lu Hsün attached utmost importance to the study of Marxist theory. His later Marxism-inspired thoughts, actions and works; his direct quotation from the teachings of the teacher of revolution Lenin; the clear descriptions in his writings of his study of Marxism-Leninism and his self-analysis in the course of struggle; the enormous quantity of references to Marxist-Leninist works in his diaries; and the large number of vivid, true recollections of Hsü Kuang-p'ing and other comrades who were familiar with Lu Hsün's work, study and life -- all of this amply proved this point. Lu Hsün's latter essays and letters are a model of close integration of theory with practice. That is why his works have not only a particularly profound ideological character but also particularly rich practical content.

Through the accumulation of quantitative changes, the shift of Lu Hsün's world outlook reached the stage of qualitative leap. But to realize this basic change, specific conditions of class struggle were required. Just as he himself said, "By sudden change it is meant that A cannot change into B when all but one conditions are there, but once this particular condition appears, it will at once change into B. Take, for example, the change of water into ice. The air temperature must drop to zero and at the same time there must be movement of the air. Without this movement water will not change into ice even if the air temperature has dropped to zero. At this juncture, when the air moves, water will immediately freeze and become ice. Superficially the change seems to be sudden, but in fact, it is not so. If the necessary conditions are absent, one cannot in fact change, even if one insists one has. That is why some petty bourgeois revolutionary writers who claimed to have changed suddenly one night suddenly changed back into their former selves not long afterward." ("Two Hearts: A Glimpse of Literature and Art in Shanghai") Here Lu Hsün in a philosophical sense profoundly revealed and defined the essence of a real, actual and solid change in world outlook as opposed to a false, superficial, shaky, even opportunistic change. The revelation contained not only factual lessons of constant "changes" by countless flip-flopping petty bourgeois writers and artists which Lu Hsün witnessed, but also the profound experience in the course of radical change in his own world outlook. The change in Lu Hsün's world outlook had a profound, solid basis and took place after prolonged, full preparation. Thus his change was really a conscious, true change. Once changed, he firmly and unwaveringly fought to the end

and became a faithful communist, "a giant in China's cultural revolution" in the midst of the enemy's "mopping-up operations."

What was the concrete condition that gave Lu Hsün's thought a tremendous shock and produced a radical change in his world outlook? It was the awesome class struggle which he personally experienced in 1927 after he arrived in Canton from Amoy. Lu Hsün came to Canton, "the cradle of revolution," full of revolutionary fervor. But the moment he arrived in Canton, he noted the contradictoriness of "white within red" and sensed something was wrong in the complexion of the Kuomintang. He formed close relations with the communists and revolutionary youths and joined in the fight. But, just when the revolution of 1927 won its victory with the strength of the proletariat, the peasantry and the other petty bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie, headed by the big bourgeoisie, perfidiously staged a counter-revolutionary coup and sprung a surprise attack on communists and the revolutionary people, thereby causing the united front of the various revolutionary classes to break down. In this great division, the revolution and the counter-revolution, the proletariat and the bourgoeisie, the communists and the Kuomintang....the features of various classes and their political parties and reprsentatives became quite clear. The relations between various classes became crystallized as never before. The class enemies were the first to lift the lid of class struggle with their bayonets! The line was drawn between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and there began a new era in which the Chinese Communist Party -- the vanguard of the Chinese proletariat -- alone led the Chinese revolution to develop in new depth. Recalling those days, Lu Hsün later said: "I had never seen people being killed like that in all my life." Moreover, "those who were involved were young people." This struggle caused a violent shock to his thinking. The fact that young people were divided into two opposing camps in class struggle "exploded" his conviction in the evolutionary inevitability that "the future will always be better than the past, and the young will always be better than the aged." ("Three Leisures: Preface") This "explosion" was a disruption of the process of gradual advance, i.e., a leap -- a leap toward the class doctrine of the materialist conception of history, a radical change toward the communist view of the universe. Hence, many problems formerly regarded as insolvable and inexplicable now became clear when viewed through Marxism. Small wonder that Lu Hsün called Marxism "the most lucid philosophy." (See Li Chi-yeh, My Recollections of Mr. Lu Hsün, p. 38) Since then Lu Hsün all the more consciously intensified his study of Marxism.

Apart from the above-mentioned objective factors, there was a very important subjective cause that enabled Lu Hsün to change from a revolutionary democrat to a great communist, and that was his strict self-analysis.

Chairman Mao points out: "In class society everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of thinking, without exception, is stamped with the brand of a class." Lu Hsün was of course no exception. Having defected from the old camp and following the advance of the time in the practice of revolutionary struggle, he headed straight forward to

the forefront of the proletarian battle, every step forward inseparable from the transformation of his world outlook. The tranformation of this subjective world required a greater degree of self-awakening than did making revolution against others. As Lu Hsün said: "Transforming oneself is always harder than restraining others." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany 2: On Writing Brushes and the Like") "But revolutionaries are not afraid to criticize themselves, and they know very clearly that they dare to speak openly." ("Three Leisures: Haziness Through 'Drunken Eyes'") Lu Hsün's self-dissection was serious and conscientious. Others "tried hard but failed to find my true symptoms" or hit the vulnerable spot. The "true symptoms" were found by himself. As he himself said: "I have really often dissected others, but even more I have ruthlessly dissected myself." ("The Tomb: Postscript to The Tomb")

Lu Hsün's dissecting knife is the weapon of Marxist class analysis. In studying Marxism, he first used it to dissect his own world outlook. He likened his translation of works about Marxism to the persecution-defying Prometheus' stealing of fire from heaven to give mankind fire and heat in Greek mythology. But, "when I stole fire from other countries, my intention was to use it to boil my own flesh." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'") His self-dissection was first of all designed to sweep away "old habits" and "ancient ghosts" in the deepest recesses of his world outlook, starting from the basic political stand and class sentiment. Thus Lu Hsün once dissected the class roots of his own thought and the course of change of his stand: "I often talk about myself: how I 'bump against a wall,' how I crawl like a snail, etc. as if all the miseries of the world were concentrated in me and I suffered for all. This is also a bad temper of the middle class intellectual. But it is true that I used to hate my own class which I knew best and whose destruction I would not regret. Later, owing to lessons learned from facts, I realized that only the newly emerging proletarian could have a future." ("Two Hearts: Preface")

It was because Lu Hsün strictly dissected himself, "frequently looked backed," ceaselessly carried out self-criticism, studied well, continually accepted new things, summed up new experience, accepted new ideas, and continually "remedied and rectified" past "deviations" with new correct ideas that he was able to leap to historical materialism from historical evolutionism and accomplish the great change from a revolutionary democrat to a communist.

Here it is additionally necessary to make one point clear: From the first, evolution (which of course does not mean evolution as underscored by vulgar evolutionists) is a general law of development of the universe, including all living things and human society. Marxist materialist dialectics undoubtedly includes views of evolution, but it does not end up in the theory of evolution. Evolutionary development as interpreted by Marxist dialectics is by far broader, deeper and richer in content than that of the Darwinist theory of evolution. Having carefully studied the dialectics of Marx, Engels and Hegel and earnestly read the history of development of dialectics in the history of European philosophy, Lenin in

his great work, "Collapse of the Second International," pointed out: "Marxian dialectics, being the last word in the scientific-evolutionary method, forbids an isolated, i.e., a one-sided and monstrously distorted, examination of an object." (Collected Works of Lenin, Vol. XXI, p. 212) Here Lenin not only made clear the qualitative difference between Marxist dialectics and the old evolutionary method, but also brought about the connection and identity between the two. The universe, living things and society are all evolving and developing, and this is a general and common phenomenon. We recognize the universality of the law of evolutionary development and reject the static, cyclical and regressive viewpoint. But what is especially important is that we must also note the qualitative difference between the forms of motion in different realms, that is, the particularity of contradictions and contradictory movement in different realms. The laws of the mode of motion of different nature are not interchangeable. Evolution of human society is developed on the basis of biological evolution, being higher, more complicated and qualitatively different than biological evolution. The particular contradictions of human society determine the particular nature of the form of motion of human society. The "deviation" in Lu Hsün's early view of history did not lie in his recognition of social development and evolution nor in his advocacy of revolution and struggle -- on the contrary, this was the revolutionary and correct aspect of his early view of history. Rather, it lay in his interpretation of essentially, radically different social historical phenomena with such things as the physiological difference in age between young and old people. Instead of interpreting history by finding the causes in social existence and from the viewpoint of class struggle, on ideological line he still belonged to the school of historical idealism. His illusions therefore had to be "exploded" by the facts of class strugle in society. How could one explain "young people are divided into two major camps" merely with the physiological difference in age? Therefore, the "thinking" that was "exploded" was not the direction of evolutionary development, but the ideological line of historical idealism. As a matter of fact, after Lu Hsün's leap from the theory of evolution to the class doctrine, he did not discard the view of evolutionary development of society. On the contrary, owing to his mastery of the Marxist theory of class struggle and establishment of the communist view of the universe and doctrine of social revolution, he was able to find the true motive force of social development, see clearly the prospects of social development, and harden his confidence in revolution. Having changed his world outlook in 1927, in his debate with the "New Moon group"--vanguard of the Kuomintang fascist cultural encirclement and suppression--on the class doctrine of the proletariat versus the landlord-bourgeois theory of hunan nature, Lu Hsün dialectically unified the class viewpoint with the developmental viewpoint. With this brand new sharp weapon, he won a clear-cut big victory, utterly refuting the erroneous view of "above class," "forever unchanging human nature" trumpeted by Liang Shih-ch'iu and his gang of comprador writers of the "New Moon group." Lu Hsün first refuted the metaphysical nonsense that human nature would never change by citing the history of mankind's evolution, pointing out: "Anthropoid ape, ape man, primitive man, ancient man, modern man, future man.... If living creatures really evolve, human nature cannot remain unchanged

forever." Then, using the class viewpoint, he refuted Liang Shih-ch'iu's erroneous defense of his theory of above-class human nature with physiological phenomena. Citing the example of sweating, he said, this seemed to happen in ancient as well as modern times, "but the sweat of a maiden 'who is so weak as to be blown away by the wind' is fragrant, while that of a worker 'stupid and clumsy like an ox' is odorous." ("That's That: Literature and Perspiration") From a purely biological point of view, sweating is sweating, an ordinary physiological phenomenon, but from the class viewpoint, sweat is tainted with the blood of class oppression and exploitation in a class society! Thus it can be seen that Lu Hsün did not abandon the view of evolutionary development, but "remedied and rectified," with the Marxist class viewpoint, "the deviation of believing solely in evolution." Marxist historical materialism, by confirming classes and class struggle as the motive force behind the development of society, not only does not abandon the view of evolutionary development, but profoundly and scientifically reveals the internal causes of evolutionary development of society. Nor does the fact that Marxism views man from the viewpoint of classes and class struggle negate the irresistible natural law of metabolism by which the young replace the old. But Marxism not only generally recognizes this physiological metabolic process, but also points out its action in life in a class society and in class struggle. "Revolution naturally has its successors," but counter-revolution also has "remnant youngsters." Therefore, acquainted with the development of human society and nature and conscious of their own historical mission, proletarian revolutionaries of the older generation must bring up millions and millions of successors to the cause of proletarian revolution in order to realize the magnificent ideals of communism, and pin their hopes on the revolutionary younger generation. This is both a class and a developmental viewpoint, a dialectically unity. Hence, knowing why "young people are divided into two main camps," Lu Hsün strove harder to "produce a multitude of new fighters" for the cause of proletarian revolution. ("Two Hearts: Views on the Left-Wing Writers Association")

So, the theory of biological evolutionary development was no longer a direct substitute for the theory of classes and class struggle, but as Marx said, it was "used as the natural-scientific basis for class struggle in history." (Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXX, p. 574) Historical idealism as the world outlook of the bourgeoisie must be "exploded"; one must firmly break with it. Rational factors of evolutionary develpment with a dialectical character, on the other hand, must be "remedied and rectified" and rescued from the system of historical idealism. Only by "exploding" the "ideological line" of the historical idealist theory of human nature is it possible to "remedy and rectify" with the class doctrine of historical materialism the "deviation" of exclusive faith in the theory of evolution. Marx began by analyzing the internal contradictions of society itself and extended the application of materialism and dialectics to the knowledge of human society, and this enabled him to discover the law of development of society itself. Thus, "the conception of history as a series of class struggles is already much richer in content and deeper than merely reducing it to weakly distinguished

phases of the struggle for existence." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol III, p. 573)

Lu Hsün lived through a difficult "exploratory" process in his leap from the theory of evolution in his early years to the class doctrine in his later years. The essence of this process was the struggle between the materialist conception and the idealist conception of history, one between the proletarian and the bourgeois world outlooks. The relationship of this struggle and transformation was one of unity of opposites. Later Lu Hsün, using the viewpoint of unity of opposites, incisively expounded the dialectical law of the genesis and development of proletarian culture in its struggle against the old culture. He said: "The new class and its culture do not fall suddenly from the sky, but probably develop from their resistance against the old rulers and their culture, that is, from their opposition to the old. Thus new culture still has its roots in the old and will have its successor. It still has its selective legacy from old culture." ("Omissions: Postscript to 'Faust and the City'") This was also the logic of his own ideological development. Lu Hsün's communist world outlook was formed in his rebellion and struggle against the feudal thought of the landlord class and the thought of the bourgeoisie, while assimilating the best of Chinese and foreign ideologies and culture.

III

After Lu Hsün mastered Marxism on the basis of unity of theory and practice and became a great communist, his thought, action and writing were elevated to a brand new stage. As a result, in his later battles, he had clearer objectives and greater distinction between foes and ourselves, he took a firmer stand and performed even more splendid exploits for the revolutionary cause of the Chinese proletariat on the cultural front.

It was through repeated verification by his practical experience in class struggle that Lu Hsün wholeheartedly accepted the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle. This is why he understood it so deeply and applied it so freely. Clearly seeing the fact of class antagonisms in real society, he was convinced that in class society no one "could rid himself of the character of the class to which he belongs." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'") Accordingly, he tightly grasped the basic clue of class struggle in dealing with people and society, so that no matter how his opponents disguised themselves, adopted evasive tactics, labeled themselves or held up deceptive banners, they could never get away from his magic mirror of class analysis that showed them up in their true colors. This enabled him to "clearly distinguish between friend and foe" in the acute, complex class and line struggles, and rout his enemies with his pen. With the fact of class antagonisms in real-life society and as reflected in literary works, he most sharply and profoundly refuted the above-class theory of human nature trumpeted by Liang Shih-ch'iu and the like. He pointed out: "Of course, 'joy, anger, sorrow and happiness are man's natural passions,' but poor men will never

know the sorrow of the stock broker who burns his fingers in the market, nor will the King of Oil ever know the miseries of the old women of Peking who pick cinder. Starving people in famine-stricken areas would not grow orchids as the aged fathers of rich men do, nor would Chiao Ta of the House of Chia fall in love with Little Sister Lin." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'") Moreover, with vivid analogy, he very eloquently criticized the class- and time-transcending nonsense advertised by the so-called "The Third Kind of Men." He said: "People who live in a class society but want to be class-transcending writers, who live in a fighting era but want to stand aloof from the fighting, who live in the present but want to write for the future, such people are an illusion of the mind, they are non-existent in the real world. To become such a man is like scratching one's head and wanting to leave the world. One cannot do so." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: On 'The Third Kind of Men'")

Lu Hsün not only saw the existence of classes and class struggle in class society, but also pointed out clearly that man's class character was "controlled by economics (and may also be said to be based or dependent on economic organization)." ("Three Leisures: Class Character of Literature") Besides, citing the fact of alternation of different socio-economic forms in the history of mankind, he refuted the idealist, metaphysical nonsense of Liang Shih-ch'iu who made the capitalist system sanctified, eternal and absolute and described it as the basis of all civilizations. Thus it can be seen that his class analysis took the materialist conception of history as its scientific theoretical basis.

Seeing clearly the law of social development convinced him that among all classes in modern society, "only the newly emerging proletarians have a future." So in 1927, after Chiang Kai-shek staged the "April 12" counter-revolutionary coup and when the forces of counter-revolution were on the rampage and seemingly invincible, while the revolution was in its most perilous stage, he resolutely stood on the side of the proletariat and consciously making the militant literature of the proletariat a wing of proletarian political struggle, carried out a tenacious struggle against the enemies at home and abroad.

Lu Hsün fought against the enemies with "the weapon of art." Yet he was able to fully realize the importance of "the art of weaponry," i.e., armed struggle. While he was still a revolutionary democrat, he already saw that "the speediest way to reform is through fire and sword." ("Letters Between Two Places," April 8, 1925) In the First Revolutionary Civil War, he further pointed out: "Present-day social conditions in China are such that the only solution is actual revolutionary war. A poem did not frighten Sun Ch'uan-fang away, but a cannon shot did." That was why he said he was more "willing to hear the sound of cannon fire" than the voice of literature. ("That's That: Literature of the Revolutionary Era") In 1927, after Chiang Kai-shek staged a counter-revolutionary coup and established a new warlord reactionary regime of the Kuomintang, the Chinese Communist Party led the revolutionary people to carry out armed uprisings, found a people's

army and establish revolutionary base areas. And toward the end of that year Lu Hsün in the article "Literature and Art and Revolution" again stressed: "There must first be an army before there can be revolution." Under the white terror of the fascist dictatorship of the Kuomintang reactionaries, he repeatedly pointed out: "Ground fire is moving underground and spreading everywhere; when lava gushes out, it will burn all the wild grass and trees, and there will be nothing left to decay." ("Three Leisures: The Way") He forecast with full revolutionary optimism: "A great era is not far away." This was because he saw that the Chinese Communist Party which represented the future of China had a revolutionary army and China had hopes. So, he said: "In whose hands is now the 'art of weaponry?' Find that out, and you know China's immediate future." ("Three Leisures: Haziness Through 'Drunken Eyes'") Lu Hsün precisely built his hopes on the cornerstone of the political party of the Chinese proletariat having acquired the "art of weaponry." So, when he learned that the Red Army led by Chairman Mao had triumphantly arrived in northern Shensi after overcoming a thousand difficulties and ten thousand dangers and completing the 25,000 li Long March without parallel in history, so happy was he that he sent out a warm congratulatory telegram: "On you are pinned the future of mankind and China." These ardent words embodied Lu Hsün's sincere proletarian feelings for Chairman Mao, the Communist Party and the Red Army, and they also expressed his firm faith in communism and far-reaching political vision.

As Lu Hsün established his communist view of the universe and doctrine of social revolution, he was able to understand correctly the historical mission of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. He pointed out: "It is for their own liberation and for the elimination of classes that the proletarians carry out revolution." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Vilification and Intimidation Is Certainly No Fighting") To attain this objective, it is necessary to practice a powerful and effective dictatorship of the proletariat. When he saw in the first state of proletarian dictatorship founded and led by Lenin and Stalin a concrete image of proletarian dictatorship, when he saw how "the future classless society" could be realized through "proletarian dictatorship," he believed that this was "our own way out." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: No Longer Shall We Be Deceived") It also made him "positively believe that a classless society will surely appear. Not only are my doubts completely swept away, but my courage is much increased." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Reply to Questions from International Literary Society") From the actual conditions of the Soviet Union after the October Revolution and from the writings of Lenin, he gained a very deep understanding of the tasks of proletarian dictatorship and the protracted, complex and profound nature of struggle. He highly praised Lenin's exposition of the tasks of proletarian dictatorship in "'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder," calling Lenin a "true revolutionary" and holding that these teachings of Lenin's were "unique." He particularly stressed the fact that Lenin "included 'custom' and 'habits' in 'culture' and believed that it was quite difficult to reform these things. I think that if these things are not reformed, revolution will accomplish nothing, like a pagoda built on sand which will collapse in no time." ("Two Hearts:

Habits and Reform") Citing the lesson of the failure of China's old democratic revolution led by the feeble Chinese bourgeoisie, Lu Hsün proved by negative example the profundity and correctness of Lenin's idea of proletarian dictatorship in all domains, including the domain of culture. Even under the Kuomintang fascist reign of terror, Lu Hsün still declared explicitly: The proletariat must seize power and make itself the ruling class, and moreover, "what it wants is overall dominion, not just a corner of it." ("Two Hearts: 'Literal Translation' and 'Class Character of Literature'") In view of the progress of China's revolution and the position and environment Lu Hsün found himself in at that time, "in writing.....I can only expose the ills of the old society." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany: Reply to Questions from International Literary Society") There was still not much opportunity for him to deal with the problem of proletarian dictatorship in all its aspects. Nevertheless, this alone sufficed to show the breadth and depth of his understanding of the necessity, character and tasks of proletarian dictatorship. Marx, the great teacher of the proletariat, clearly summed up his new contribution to the theory of classes and class struggle into the following points: "(1) That the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production, (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, pp. 332-333) We see that what Lu Hsün stressed were precisely these basic points enumerated by Marx here and Lenin's new development of these basic problems, particularly ideas concerning class struggle and proletarian dictatorship.

In his life Lu Hsün passed through two major historical phases -- the old democratic revolution and the new democratic revolution -- that marked drastic changes in Chinese society. He saw repeated trials of strength between revolution and counter-revolution, between restoration and counter-restoration. He witnessed much class struggle; he had rich experiences and lessons of class struggle, historical and contemporary, positive and negative. He saw most clearly the roots of evil of the old society, and he was most familiar with the enemy's activity. Now, scientifically summing up these experiences of class struggle from the viewpoint of Marxism and observing society with Marxism as the telescope and microscope, he was able to see farther and more clearly, and grasp the law of class struggle more tightly. He said: "Astute action stems only from true, practical understanding." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: More on 'The Third Kind of Men'") That was why he could so skillfully unify to a high degree the firm, thorough revolutionary spirit with a clever, flexible art of struggle, to deal the enemy a lasting, powerful blow. That was why he could see so sharply the various reflections of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie in the ranks of revolutionary forces, the influence of the opportunist line and the "maggots" that had infiltrated the revolutionary ranks, and wage an effective struggle against them. The crystallization of Lu Hsün's rich experience in class struggle and two-line struggle in his later writings is down to the present day still a sharp weapon for us to fight against class enemies who use "the old tactics" of counter-revolution under the new historical conditions.

The development of the worker-peasant revolutionary movement and the change in Lu Hsün's world outlook enabled him to find the leaders of revolution, recognize the main forces of the revolution, see the enormous revolutionary strength of the proletariat and the masses of people, and at the same time discern the cruel features and the decadent, feeble nature of the reactionary ruling class. This hardened his confidence in the victory of the revolution all the more. In the essay, "Have the Chinese Lost Their Self-Confidence?", for example, by means of class analysis, he exposed on the one hand the reactionary rulers who depended on foreign imperialists. While they were in their masters' favor, they had "confidence in others," namely, they could only rely on the foreign big people, but when they were out of favor, they lost even this "confidence in others," and all they had was "self-deception." They never had any "self-confidence." At the same time, he pointed out: "Whether there is self-confidence or not is not to be judged by the writings of a high official or prime minister; one must look for it underground." These "underground" forces, needless to say, referred to the Chinese Communist Party and the broad mass of revolutionary people. They alone were China's "sinews and spine." Courageous, unyielding struggles of resistance by the revolutionary people who were led by the Chinese Communist Party convinced Lu Hsün that the flames of the people's revolution could never be put out: "So long as there is flint, there will always be fire." ("Ch'iehchieht'ing Miscellany II: 'Undecided Topic' Draft (9)") So, no matter how the reactionaries persecuted the revolutionary forces, his confidence in the inevitable victory of revolution remained unshaken. He said: The reactionary rulers, "in order to 'prevent slaves from rebelling,' resort more and more to 'brutal torture,' but 'brutal torture' lands them in a blind alley." "Lessons of brutality harden people's senses, so they no longer feel its sting," and even if "people were so governed that they became unfeeling like thick-skinned pachyderms, they would advance trampling on brutality because of their pachydermous skin." ("Southern Tone and Northern Tune: Written by Accident") These words of Lu Hsün's profoundly reflected the tough, stubborn struggle of the Chinese people led by the Chinese Communist Party under the savage fascist rule of the Kuomintang reactionaries. When the Kuomintang reactionaries were frenziedly butchering revolutionary writers, Lu Hsün again pointed out through dialectical analysis: the fact that the reactionary ruling class resorted to this "ultimate means" exactly "proves that they are animals of darkness on their way to extinction." At the same time, it also attested to the development and growth of the revolutionary forces. Hence, "so long as the great masses exist and gain strength, the revolutionary literature of the proletariat will also grow in strength." ("Two Hearts: The Revolutionary Literature of the Chinese Proletariat and the Blood of the Vanguards") It was this strong communist faith and encouragement from the tremendous strength of the masses of people that enabled Lu Hsün to avoid falling again into indecision, perplexity and anguish as he once did in his "search," and to display more youthful strength as he grew older.

In his later years, as a result of his mastery of Marxism-Leninism and knowledge of dialectics, Lu Hsün's knowledge and analysis of other problems also underwent profound changes. Things which he criticized from

the revolutionary democratic stand in his early years were in his later years analyzed and criticized anew from the communist view of the universe and especially from the viewpoint of classes and class struggle. This made his criticism more scientific and deeper. Lop-sided, even erroneous views he had previously held on certain problems were rectified in his later years.

Of course, this does not mean that, having effected a radical change in his world outlook, Lu Hsün "became perfect and stood still." As he himself said: "Revolution never ends. If there were ever such thing as 'stopping at perfection,' the world would also become frozen." ("That's That: Random Thoughts in the Yellow Flower Festival") Having effected the great change in his world outlook, Lu Hsün did not stand still but making the change a new starting point, went on to transform himself and the world even more consciously. Two months before he died and while he was critically ill, he wrote "Reply to Hsü Mao-yung and On the Problems of the Anti-Japan United Front," a condemnation of Wang Ming's Right capitulationist line. It concluded with this moving vow: "If I can live on, I must of course continue to study." That was why the older he became, the more skilled he was in applying Marxism-Leninism. Lu Hsün's later years were a period of extraordinarily acute and complicated national and class contradictions and line struggle. Shanghai, where he fought, was the center of Kuomintang reactionary rule. White terror reigned supreme, and here the leadership of underground Party organizations was usurped by Wang Ming, Liu Shao-ch'i and the like. The situation was highly dangerous. But Lu Hsün was unafraid and fought courageously. Amid the counter-revolutionary "encirclement" of the Kuomintang reactionaries and attacked from inside and outside by Trotskyites and Right opportunists, he stood firm like a rock in the middle of a river, firmly defending Chairman Mao's correct line, resolutely upholding the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and becoming as he was a great man of China's cultural revolution.

Historical dialectics is ruthless. Lu Hsün, adjudged a "fellow traveler" of revolution by some people wearing the cloak of "Communist," became a true communist fighter after traversing a difficult course. But history proves that they themselves were at most no more than bourgois or petty bourgeois democrats, the Party's fellow travelers during the period of the democratic revolution (some even became renegades in this period). By the period of socialist revolution, they have become capitalist roaders in power in the Party representing the interests of the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, the opponents of socialist revolution. Concerning such "fellow travelers," Lu Hsün pointed out long ago that when they joined the revolution, they did not have "the faith and will to fight and even die for the revolution, but were merely companions for part of the journey." ("Foreword to 'The Harp'") So, "having traveled together part of the way," they "would inevitably break away and change midway to socialist construction." ("Postscript to 'October'") In his life Lu Hsün experienced the amalgamation and division of the revolutionary forces many times, with some fellow travelers leaving the revolutionary ranks every time. In the course of the revolution, "very often some drop

out, some defect, some degenerate, some rebel." ("Two Hearts: Non-Revolutionary Revolutionary Radicalists") Some, "having climbed higher, become more amiable and finally become outright notables in elite society," turning from "fashionable" into "restorationists." ("Color Literature: Trend and Restorationist") Some "change as soon as they gain face" ("Outside of Collections: Dedication to Wu Ch'i-shan"), do an about-face, and oppress and exploit the people. But Lu Hsün never changed till his last days. "Fierce-browed, I coolly defy a thousand pointing fingers; head-bowed, like a willing ox I serve the children." As long as he breathed, he never ceased fighting and forever maintained his revolutionary youthfulness. Lu Hsün's great change from a revolutionary democrat to a communist set a shining example for us in the transformation of our world outlook.

Today, China is in a vitally important historical period. Led by Chairman Mao and the Party Central Committee and under conditions of proletarian dictatorship, the people of the whole country are continuing to deepen the socialist revolution. The prime target of revolution is the bourgeoisie, and the main object of struggle is the Party bourgeoisie, namely, those in power taking the capitalist road. As the struggle is extremely complex and acute, the occurrence of "division, union and change" of "fellow travelers" as mentioned by Lu Hsün long ago is inevitable. One either thoroughly changes his world outlook and advances together with revolution or leaves it and becomes a target of revolution. Teng Hsiao-p'ing, the No. 2 man of Liu Shao-ch'i's bourgeois headquarters, was criticized and educated by the masses during the great proletarian cultural revolution. But he has not really accepted this criticism and education nor changed his world outlook. Saying "I regret my errors and will start a new life," he pledged "never to reverse verdicts." But after he resumed office, he discarded his camouflage, served as commander in blowing the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts and became the biggest unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party. This is food for thought. "The giant wheels of the times really can callously crush people to a pulp." ("Pseudo-Freedom Letters: Postscript") Today, the question of truly establishing the communist world outlook of the proletariat confronts everyone even more practically and sharply. Everyone must study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought; everyone needs remolding. Otherwise, some will turn bad. Therefore, we must more profoundly understand the great practical and far-reaching historical significance of Chairman Mao's oft-repeated call to us to read Lu Hsün's books and "learn from the example of Lu Hsün." We must actively take part in practical class struggle, more profoundly criticize Teng Hsiao-p'ing, hit back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, resolutely strike at the sabotage activities of counter-revolutionaries, and consolidate and develop the gains of the great cultural revolution. Amid struggle, we must earnestly study Chairman Mao's important directives concerning the great cultural revolution and hitting back at the Right deviationist wind to reverse verdicts, study the theory of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, make clear the question of where the bourgeoisie is and of

total dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, firmly insist on opposing and preventing revisionism, make an effort to remold our world outlook, and ceaselessly heighten our consciousness of class struggle, line struggle, and continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must firmly maintain class struggle as the key link, and forever advance along the revolutionary line indicated by Chairman Mao!

* * *

The Social Economy of the Ch'in Shih Huang Era

by

Ts'ao Yung-nien (曹永年) and

Meng Kuang-yao (孟广耀)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 3, June 20, 1976)

(I)

In a period of big social changes accompanying the transition from the slave system to the feudal system in our country, Ch'in Shih Huang with great ability and foresight firmly enforced the Legalist line. Raising the iron fist of the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class, he "conquered the six states," "burned the Confucian books and buried the Confucian scholars alive," struck at the reactionary slave-owning class, and founded a united feudal state with centralization of power, thereby writing an indelible page in China's ancient history.

What impact these revolutionary measures of the landlord class taken by Ch'in Shih Huang produced on the social economy was a major subject of public debate in the history of feudal society that lasted more than 2,000 years in our country.

Chang Erh and Ch'en Yü, two representative figures of the slave-owning aristocratic forces who once sneaked into the peasant insurgent army, were the first to jump out to draw a gloomy picture of the social economy in the era of Ch'in Shih Huang. They cried aloud: "Ch'in's tyranny and severe punishments brought miseries to the world for several decades! There was the great wall in the north and Wuling in the south. Unrest originated at home and abroad. The common people suffered. Heavy taxes were collected to pay for military spending. The country was financially bankrupt and the people were impoverished and destitute." (Historical Records: Biographies of Chang Erh and Ch'en Yü) By means of grafting flowers from one tree to another, they shifted the blame for Chao Kao's reactionary policies and their consequences onto Ch'in Shih Huang and, exaggerating them, went all out to attack Ch'in Shih Huang and give the fullest possible vent to their deepseated hatred for the new society.

In the course of the landlord class gradually shifting from its pro-Legalist and anti-Confucian stand to the pro-Confucian and anti-Legalist stand, the head of the reactionary Confucian scholars Tung Chung-shu led a full-scale attack against Ch'in Shih Huang by condemning the Ch'in Dynasty for "adopting the laws of Shen Pu-hai and Shang Yang, practicing the theories of Han Fei Tzu, spurning the true way of kings and emperors, and combining greed with cruelty," and for "levying such excessive taxes that the people were deprived of their means of subsistence. Their families broken up, they were unable to engage in farming and weaving,

and bandits rose everywhere." (Book of Han: Biography of Tung Chung-shu) Spreading rumors to deceive and frighten the people, he alleged that under the rule of the Legalist line of Shang Yang and Ch'in Shih Huang, feudal corvee was "30 times greater than it was in antiquity," and taxes "20 times greater than in antiquity," in other words, exploitation was 30 or 20 times greater than under the slave system. The result was that "the people were worried about their livelihood, fled to the jungles and became bandits. Those who were caught and died in prison were counted by the thousands a year." The rumors of this "disciple of the sage" appeared to establish the various allegations concerning the social unrest, production stagnation and bankruptcy of the feudal economy in the Ch'in Dynasty.

In the 2,000 years that followed, to meet the needs of class struggle, reactionaries of every description invariably jumped out from time to time to pick up the themes of Chang Erh, Ch'en Yü and Tung Chung-shu and denounced Ch'in Shih Huang for "burning the books and burying the Confucian scholars alive," saying arbitrarily that Ch'in Shih Huang's Legalist line "sabotaged" production in order to insinuate against and attack the current revolutionary class, revolutionary movement or reform of certain progressive meaning.

According to the logic of reactionaries, revolution causes "production disruption" and "destruction of culture," and this is true of the revolutions of the past and even truer of the contemporary revolution. Revisionist chieftains such as Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-p'ing are the advocates of such a reactionary theory. Teng Hsiao-p'ing, the arch unrepentant capitalist roader in the Party, raising the ensign of "achieving four modernizations," did his best to peddle the theory of productive forces and slander the great proletarian cultural revolution as "a terrible mess." Stepping into the shoes of Lin Piao, a handful of ferocious counter-revolutionary elements in the counter-revolutionary political incident at Tienanmen Square wantonly cried aloud that "gone for good is the feudal society of Ch'in Shih Huang." Emulating Teng Hsiao-p'ing's tactics, they raised the signboard of "four modernizations." A gang of Party bourgeoisie and freaks and demons in society charged that Ch'in Shih Huang's landlord class revolutionary dictatorship wrecked the social economy at that time and revolution was undesirable. From this the inference is drawn that if we are to achieve "four modernizations," it is necessary to reverse the decisions of the great cultural revolution, settle account with it, change Chairman Mao's proletarian revolutionary line and abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country. This band of restorationist maniacs are precisely the disciples of Tung Chung-shu, Chang Erh and Ch'en Yü.

(II)

Mr. Lu Hsün once pointed out incisively: "Historical records and conclusions are sometimes most unreliable and cannot be trusted in many respects. The reason, as we normally understand, is that when a dynasty was long, it was bound to have a great number of good people, and when a

dynasty was short, there were virtually no good people in it. Why? Because when a dynasty was long, those who wrote its history were people of that dynasty and they of course commended the rulers of their dynasty. When a dynasty was short, those who wrote its history were people of other dynasties and they quite naturally deprecated the rulers of that dynasty. Therefore, almost all historical records about the Ch'in Dynasty do not show even half a good man in it." (Complete Works of Lu Hsün, Vol. III, pp. 379-380) In order to restore the old order and fabricate rumors to curse Ch'in Shih Huang, reactionary Confucian scholars had to tamper with and obliterate the true history of the former dynasty. Consequently, the history of Ch'in as we know it today is completely different from what it actually was from social economy and politics to Ch'in Shih Huang as an individual. Even if bits of true facts were disclosed, it would be nothing more than "the moonlight shining on the terrace through the dense leaves, and only fragments of the shadow could be seen." (Ibid., p. 13) Hence, to restore the true picture of this period of landlord class revolution in Chinese history and to smash the rumors and sophistries of restorationists, it is vitally important for us to do some research and verification on the history of Ch'in from the Marxist viewpoint.

Both the vast population and the ample stocks of grains in the Ch'in Dynasty suffice to show the general condition of economic prosperity during the period of Ch'in Shih Huang.

There were originally accurate figures about the population of the Ch'in Dynasty. (According to "Biography of Prime Minister Hsiao" in Historical Records, when Hsiao Ho entered Hsienyang, he "collected the books and documents of the prime ministers and official historians of Ch'in and kept them in his possession;" "therefore, he knew the strategic areas of the country, its population, its strengths and weaknesses, and the sufferings of the people.") But the records were lost. In later ages it was estimated: "According to the theories of Su and Chang, soldiers that survived the wars in Ch'in and the six states east of the mountains numbered more than 5 million; calculated on this basis, the civilian population should be more than 10 million. When Ch'in annexed the princes and set up 36 prefectures, about two-thirds of the people were killed or wounded, and yet it still had the ability to organize an expedition against the barbarians and collect over half of the taxes. More than 400,000 people perished in building the great wall in the north, more than 500,000 in Wuling in the south and more than 700,000 while building the Afang Palace. In more than ten years, countless people died on the road." ("Records of Prefectural States" in Sequel to Book of Han, quoted from "Chronicles of Kings and Emperors") On the basis of this reasoning, the population of the whole country at the time it was unified was only several million, and by the time Ch'in Shih Huang passed away, it should be even less. The estimate arrived at by some historical workers was greater than this figure; they believed that the population stood at 10 or 20 million. In fact, when Ch'en Sheng started the uprising in the first year of the Second Emperor of Ch'in, he entered Ch'en and established Chang and Ch'iu; "at that time the Ch'u troops numbered a million." ("Military Study I" in General Studies; see also "Biographies of Chang Erh and Ch'en Yü in Historical Records) The area covered only the present-day

Honan and Anhwei. In about one or two months the insurgent army developed from several hundred to a million men, and logically the population in this region should not be less than 5 million, which was already equivalent to the nation's total number as given in "Chronicles of Kings and Emperors." Obviously, the above estimates were far away from the actual situation.

Concrete materials that can be studied at present concerning the population of the Ch'in Dynasty consist of the following. First, around 237 B.C., Loyang had over 100,000 households. ("Biography of Lü Pu-wei" in Historical Records) Calculated on the traditional basis that each household consisted of five persons, the city's population should be half a million. Second, after the unification of the country by Ch'in, the Ch'üni county alone had more than 30,000 households ("Family History of Prime Minister Ch'en" in Historical Records), namely, 150,000 persons. Third, in 209 B.C. in Tungyang county "young people" who participated in the uprisings numbered 20,000. ("Chronicles of Hsiang Yü" in Historical Records) On this assumption, the whole county should have 100,000 people. Viewed in isolation, these records did not seem to show anything, but if they were compared with the figures of the Western Han period, they reflected the situation. Loyang of Western Han had 52,839 households ("Geographical Records" in Book of Han), only a little more than half the number during the Ch'in Dynasty. In Ch'üni, "many fled" in early Han, and only "5,000 households" were left behind ("Family History of Prime Minister Ch'en" in Book of Han), merely one-sixth the number during the Ch'in Dynasty; after more than 70 years of resumed growth, the county had 16,000 households by the 5th year of Yüankuang (120 B.C.) during the reign of Emperor Wu. ("List of Meritorious Officials" in Book of Han) The above few examples reveal one important historical fact: during the period of Ch'in Shih Huang or toward the end of the Ch'in Dynasty, many well-known cities at that time had a large population, the actual number of households in some even surpassing that during the period of Western Han. In the early years of the reign of Emperor P'ing of Western Han, the country had more than 12,230,000 households or more than 59,590,000 persons. Based on the assumption of the conditions of Loyang, Ch'üni and other places during the Ch'in Dynasty, the total population of Ch'in should not be too far away from that of Western Han. The previous estimated figure of about 10 million was obviously unreliable. Deliberate attempts such as that made in "Chronicles of Kings and Emperors" to under-estimate the population of Ch'in were intended to draw a gloomy picture of society at that time and thus to add more new evidence to the "tyranny" of Ch'in Shih Huang.

The vast population provided society with large amounts of material wealth to fill the coffers of the feudal state. This important fact was cited in many historical works.

When Liu Pang advanced toward Ch'enliu in his westward drive in 207 B.C., Li Sheng praised that city for "having large reserves of grains." ("Biography of Li Sheng" in Historical Records), maintaining that if Ch'enliu were taken, "Ch'in's grain reserves could be obtained." ("Chronicles of Kao Tsu" in Historical Records) When they reached Nanyang, Ch'en Hui

counselled Liu Pang, saying: "Wan is the capital of a big prefecture. It is linked to dozens of cities. It has a large population and huge stocks." (Ibid.) "Huge stocks" principally referred to the reserves of grains. In 203 B.C., in the final stages of the war between Ch'u and Han, P'eng Yüeh captured more than 20 cities near Chang-i, and "obtained more than 100,000 piculs of grain for the emperor of Han." ("Biography of P'eng Yüeh" in Historical Records) These 100,000 or more piculs of grain also should have been stored up in the period of Ch'in Shih Huang.

What was eye catching was the grain stored in Aotsang. Aotsang was a huge granary established by Ch'in in Ch'engkao. (See "Chronicles of Hsiang Yü" in Historical Records and other works.) In 196 B.C., when Ying Pu revolted against Han, some people worried that he might "take the grain of Aotsang to buy the population of Ch'engkao." ("Biography of Ch'ing Pu" in Historical Records) In the 15 years from the death of Ch'in Shih Huang to the elimination of Ying Pu by Liu Pang, Aotsang was unexhausted. One could just imagine the huge amounts of grain stored there. In 205 B.C., during the battle at P'engch'eng, Liu Pang was heavily defeated by Hsiang Yü. Liu's several hundred thousand men were completely wiped out. When he reached Yingyang, he regrouped his remnant forces, who were joined by troops sent by Hsiao Ho from Kuanchung. They also "built a waterway in order to get the grain of Aotsang." ("Chronicles of Hsiang Yü" in Historical Records) Their strength revived, they engaged with Hsiang Yü in a stalemate in this region for more than one year. In this a vital role was obviously played by Aotsang's ample grain supply. In 205 B.C., in the course of this stalemate Hsiang Yü gradually got the upper hand. Liu Pang was besieged at Yingyang and, being unable to seek peace, broke out toward places between Yeh and Wan to the south. An analysis showed that a factor that could not be overlooked in Hsiang Yü's victory in this period was that he cut off Liu Pang's supply from Aotsang by "several times seizing the waterway." ("Chronicles of Kao Tsu" in Historical Records) At this time, Liu Pang intended to abandon the areas east of Ch'engkao and set up defenses against Ch'u along the line of Kung and Lo. Li Shih-ch'i vigorously opposed this, and his principal argument was based on the grain of Aotsang. He said: "Aotsang has long been the supplier of grain to the country. Your humble servant learns that it still has large reserves of grain hidden. The people of Ch'u took Yingyang but did not hold on to Aotsang and went north. I propose that we send troops to defend Ch'engkao. This is a God-send gift to Han." Therefore, he proposed the strategy of "speedily despatching troops to re-take Yingyang and take possession of Aotsang." ("Biography of Li Sheng" in Historical Records) Convinced, Liu Pang accepted his proposal and for a second time "took Ch'eng-kao, expanded his army, and depended on Aotsang for grain supply." ("Chronicles of Hsiang Yü" in Historical Records) He continued the see-saw war with Hsiang Yü, unceasingly sapped Hsiang Yü's strength, and finally won the victory. In the last analysis, Liu Pang's victory was a victory of the newly emerging landlord class, which had the support of the masses of the people, over the reactionary slave-owning class, a victory of the progressive Legalist line over the restorationist Confucian line. The problem of food was an important aspect of the struggle. Ch'in Shih Huang's stockpiling of grains at Aotsang was obviously a component part of the general strategy

for preventing restoration by the aristocracies of the six states. Years later, these grain stocks finally provided favorable conditions for Liu Pang to overcome his temporary inferior position, to turn from weak to strong, defeat Hsiang Yü and win the victory in the struggle against restoration and splittism.

"Ch'in's land" in Kuanchung, Shu and Han were formerly places under the jurisdiction of the state of Ch'in. Owing to the more thorough reforms introduced by Shang Yang and the continued implementation of the Legalist line, these places in the whole of the Ch'in-Han period always held the lead in the development of production and became important economic centers of the entire country. "Geographical Records" in Book of Han has this to say: "The former lands of Ch'in were one-third of the country and their population was also no more than one-third of the country's total. But they had 60 percent of the country's total wealth." Kuanchung, being an important producer of grain, had still more ample reserves of grain. "The Money-Makers" in Historical Records says: "The ancestor of the Jen family of Hsüanch'ü was a granary officer at Tutao. When the Ch'in empire was overthrown and the chief citizens were scrambling for gold and jade, Jen's was the only family to store up grain," and consequently became enormously wealthy. Hsüanch'ü was in Kuanchung, and the Tutao granary was probably a granary for transit shipments of grain. (Notes on three families in "The Money-Makers" in Historical Records) In the outlying areas of the city of Ch'engtu there were also old granaries established during the Ch'in time. ("Biography of Kung Sun-shu" in Posterior Book of Han) It appeared that granaries of this type were quite many and, moreover, were fully loaded with grain. When Liu Pang entered Kuanchung, the people of Ch'in offered their grain to his army, but he refused, saying: "We do not lack grain in our granaries. We have no need for your grain." ("Chronicles of Kao Tsu" in Historical Records) This should be a fact. Therefore, even though during the war between Ch'u and Han the peasants of Kuanchung, who shouldered the heavy responsibility of carrying out the war against restoration, "could not farm and the price of a picul of rice rose to ten thousand" ("The Money-Makers" in Historical Records), there were still large stocks of grain in reserve. For it was only on this premise that Hsiao Ho could continuously have "the grain of Shu and Han" ("Biography of Ch'ing Pu" in Historical Records) "shipped to Kuangchung to meet the food requirements." ("Family History of Prime Minister Hsiao" in Historical Records) With "enough troops and sufficient grain," they were able to "lead the people to pacify the world." ("Records of Hanchung" in National Records of Huayang) And such families as the Jen's, the stealers and speculative merchants of grain, were also able to seize the opportunity to exploit the people and reap fabulous fortunes.

The drastic increase in population and financial solvency brought about unprecedented prosperity in the feudal economy in the Ch'in Dynasty after the unification.

In 215 B.C., an inscription carved on the city gate at Chiehshih praised the society of Ch'in after the unification, reading: "The land is

subdued, an end put to conscript labor, the world is at peace. Men take pleasure in farming and women care for the home; there is order in all things. His kindness extends to all, the land is shared out, all live content with their lot." ("Chronicles of Ch'in Shih Huang" in Historical Records). Even if there was some exaggeration in the words of the inscription, judging by the population and grain storage at that time, the content of the inscription still could basically be trusted. It drew a picture of social stability, economic development and the daily increasing consolidation of the new mode of production in the Ch'in Dynasty.

Of course, the state founded by Ch'in Shih Huang was after all a feudal state with centralization of power in the hands of the landlord class, and the economic prosperity of the Ch'in society was only the prosperity of the feudal economy, for it was based on the exploitation of the peasantry. Nevertheless, the economic prosperity could not be denied. It was completely futile for Chang Erh, Ch'en Yü, Tung Chung-shu and the modern reactionaries to describe the social economy of the Ch'in Dynasty as bad, nor did their attack on Ch'in Shih Huang and his Legalist line merit a rebuttal.

(III)

The prosperity of the feudal economy of the Ch'in Dynasty was a product of the times, a solid fruit born of the tree of revolution.

The Spring and Autumn and Warring States epoch was one of big changes accompanying the transition from the slave to the feudal system in our society. In the more than 200 years of the Warring States, one stormy slave uprising after another struck at the reactionary rule of the slave-owners. Relying on the strength of the masses of people, the newly emerging landlord class in the various principalities used the political power they had acquired to continue to change the old relations of production and superstructure under the slave system and to develop the new feudal relations of production and superstructure. Despite continuing fighting at that time, the level of development of the social productive forces was markedly higher than during the Spring and Autumn period. At that time, the state of Wei, located in the central plains, was already "booming in agriculture and animal husbandry. There was ceaseless flow of men, horses and carriages on the road both day and night, as if three armies were marching on the road." ("Biography of Su Ch'in" in Historical Records) The situation was generally similar in other regions. The rise in the rate of farm production enabled a farmer tilling a hundred mow of land to reach the level of "an upper peasant capable of feeding nine persons." The development of agriculture and handicrafts was followed by the rapid emergence of commercial cities. As Chao She said, at that time "cities each measuring ten thousand chang and having ten thousand families looked on each other." ("Stratagems of Chao, III" in Stratagems of Warring States) On this basis, in the early Warring States period, the various states all had strong economic and military strength.

However, the further development of the feudal economy was severely restricted in the six states east of Kuanchung. Lack of thoroughness in their reforms explained the existence in large measure of the vestiges of the slave system, the line of rule of law was not implemented with vigor, and production lagged despite efforts. As Han Fei said: "If those who execute the laws are weak, the state is weak." ("On Having Standards" in Han Fei Tzu) And the economic strength of the state also declined as a result. Unless a feudal state completely crushed the old system both politically and economically, it would open the floodgate for the comeback of the slave-owners.

The restorationist activities of the slave-owning class not only directly threatened feudal rule politically but also disintegrated the economic base on which the dictatorship of the landlord class was founded. Han Fei pointed out sharply: "When the government is poor while the high officials are rich, the law-abiding citizens are poor while the parasites are rich, people who farm and fight in war are impoverished while those who engage in secondary pursuits are benefited" ("Signs of Collapse" in Han Fei Tzu), these were the causes that could lead to the collapse of a state. Here he saw the fact that those big and small slave-owners and the social forces attached to them were undermining the dictatorship of the landlord class economically. He said: "The sage rules by law. When the laws are clear, the officials will obey them. There must be rewards and punishments; if rewards and punishments are not given where they are due, then the people will become unruly. When the officials obey the laws, the state will be rich. When the state is rich, its army will be strong, and the ruler of the state will achieve his hegemonic cause." ("Six Prohibitions" in Han Fei Tzu) To practice the rule of law severely in order to strike at the slave-owning class and its agents within the feudal regime and to win the support of the masses of people -- this is the way to make the state rich economically and strong militarily. To make the state rich and strong is for achieving the "hegemonic cause" of the landlord class, namely, to build its own consolidated rule within the whole country. Han Fei's views embodied the correct understanding of the pre-Ch'in Legalists in respect to the relationship between politics and economics. Guided by this understanding, Ch'in Shih Huang conducted his struggle against restoration and powerfully accelerated the development of the feudal economy.

In 231 B.C., Ch'in began its war to eliminate the six states and unify the country. Simultaneously with wiping out the secessionist regimes of the six states, Ch'in Shih Huang applied the power of dictatorship and resolutely reformed the old system of ownership. With a view to striking harsh blows at and suppressing the remnant forces of the slave system, he extensively pushed the policy of "resettling the rich and the powerful" by resettling slave-owning nobles en masse in the border and other regions. Large numbers of slave-owners in Kuantung were sent to Pa and Shu. ("Records of Shu" in National Records of Huayang and "The Money-Makers" in Historical Records) In the state of Ch'u some nobles were resettled in the regions of Tsin and Tai in the north. ("Resettlement" in Book of Han) People of distinguish families in the central plains were sent to set up homes in Lunghsi. ("List of Prime Ministers and Their Families" in New Book

of T'ang) In many other places the powerful and the rich were transferred to Nanyang. ("The Money-Makers" in Historical Records) In 221 B.C., having crushed the splittist and restorationist forces represented by Wang Wan, Ch'in Shih Huang again "resettled 120,000 rich and powerful families in Hsienyang." ("Chronicles of Ch'in Shih Huang in Historical Records) In this way, several hundred thousand families of nobles, slave-owners in industry and commerce and local bullies practicing the slave system either abandoned their homes and fled or were executed or forced to settle elsewhere. Extremely heavy blows were thus dealt to the restorationist forces of the slave-owners.

The rich and powerful people who were moved away from their homes in the course of countrywide unification by Ch'in were called "captives." "The Money-Makers" in Historical Records says: "The ancestor of the Chos of Shu came from Chao, where he made a fortune by smelting iron. When Ch'in conquered Chao, the family was moved away and Cho and his wife as captives had to push a cart to the place assigned to them. Other captives had little money." As a matter of fact, Ch'in used violence to deprive them of their property and drive them out of their homes. The 120,000 families which were resettled in Hsienyang in 221 B.C. were far better off than the "resettled captives," but they could not bring along the vast tracts of land and the large numbers of slaves with them. Property owned by slave-owners who were executed or fled was naturally confiscated. Engels pointed out: "The object of all so-called political revolutions, from first to last, was to protect one kind of property by confiscating -- also called stealing -- another kind of property." (Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXI, p. 131) The blows struck by Ch'in Shih Huang at the slave-owning class before and after unifying the country represented a profound revolution by the landlord class against the slave-owning class.

As many slave-owning nobles and merchants were executed or moved away, Ch'in inherited large numbers of slaves and a lot of land. In what form were these huge amounts of labor power and means of production reorganized under new conditions?

These slaves were emancipated. In 221 B.C., Ch'in Shih Huang decreed that "the people be called black-headed people" ("Chronicles of Ch'in Shih Huang" in Historical Records), legally confirming their position as free people. Like those who were emancipated before them, these freed slaves became middle or small landlords and peasants under the feudal system.

The land -- part of it appeared to have become "public land" under the direct control of the state. But as the war of unification had yet to be consummated, feudal regimes had yet to be established at various levels, and the Ch'in court had a host of political problems to be settled urgently, it was well impossible for the state to exercise direct control over and use so much land at once. What was more, the landlord class at that time was still struggling to win the support of the broad masses of people in order to consolidate the newly established unified kingdom. In

215 B.C., that is, the second year after the order requiring the "black-headed people to report their land holdings" was issued, Ch'in Shih Huang's inscription carved on the city gate of Chiehshih mentioned that "His kindness extends to all, the land is shared out." "The land is shared out" might be taken to mean a portion of the land, which had long ago been owned by the slaves who tilled it in the past and who now had become middle or small landlords and peasants who tilled their own land.

But the land owned by these middle or small landlords and peasants who tilled their own land was not recorded on the state register. In order to obtain legal protection, they were willing to pay taxes to and perform voluntary labor for the feudal state. So, the 7th year after unification, on the eve of the large-scale resistance against the Huns, Ch'in Shih Huang took measures to consolidate the land holdings and taxes and issued the order "requiring the black-headed people to report their own land holdings." "Own" of "their own land holdings" vividly reflected the common desire of the land owners in the feudal state (including the middle or small landlords and peasants who till their own land) to establish their title of the land after the ownership of slave-owners was abolished. The landlord class naturally supported this law which represented their interests, but the masses of peasants, even though they had to accept the "laws" of the Ch'in Dynasty and possibly rather heavy feudal exploitation, were nevertheless willing to shoulder this burden. As Engels pointed out: "When a mode of production is at the ascending phase of its own development, even those who suffer from the mode of distribution that corresponds with this mode of production will also warmly welcome it." (Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 188) As a new-born thing, the feudal system of land ownership (including ownership by peasants who tilled their own land, which at that time was a subordinated and supplementary part of the feudal system of land ownership) spread rapidly and irresistibly throughout the country. After the appearance of the superstructure, it turned into a tremendous force actively helping the formation and consolidation of its own base. Precisely because of this, the social reform before and after the unification of the country by Ch'in surpassed any of the past in terms of speed.

"Revolution liberates productive forces and promotes their development." Due to the implementation of the Legalist line and the adoption of a series of revolutionary measures by Ch'in Shih Huang, the old base of the slave system and the slave-owning class were struck destructive blows, and this not only assured the unification and stability of the country but also promoted the rapid development of productive forces under the new fuedal system. It was under such historical conditions that the economic prosperity of the feudal society in the Ch'in Dynasty appeared quickly.

Marx said: "Without confrontation there will be no progress. This is the law followed by civilization down to the present day. Up to now, the productive forces have developed according to the law of such confrontation between classes." (Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 104) The prosperity of the feudal economy during the reign of Ch'in Shih Huang once more proves that this law was applicable in the past and is

applicable at present. By cursing Ch'in Shih Hung, opposing the need to take class struggle as the key link and madly advocating the theory of productive forces, the unrepentant capitalist roader within the Party Teng Hsiao-p'ing and a handful of counter-revolutionary elements have merely exposed their reactionary features as people who resist the objective law of historical development and vainly try to turn the clock backward and restore the old order.

* * *

We Certainly Cannot Take the Same Road As Those Who Try To Abolish Class Struggle

by

Worker-Peasant-Soldier Students of Class 1974
and Teachers of World History Group, Departments
of History, Peking Normal University

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1976)

In 1879, when Marx and Engels were waging a fierce struggle against opportunism, they solemnly proclaimed: "In the past 40 years we have all given special emphasis to class struggle, holding it to be the direct motive force of history; in particular, we have stressed the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, considering it a great lever for transforming modern society; therefore, we cannot take the same road as those people who would like to abolish class struggle from the movement."*

Great revolutionary leaders Marx and Engels, ever since they originated the scientific doctrine of communism in their early youth, had raised high the great banner of class struggle by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and waged an uncompromising struggle against all kinds of opportunism. Opportunists within the workers' movement are vicious enemies of Marxism. Engels pointed out: "The reason why they look on Marx and all of us with such enmity is that we advocate class struggle."** Therefore, the whole history of the struggle between Marxism and opportunism is one which centers on the question of whether or not we want to persist in class struggle and proletarian dictatorship.

I

During the first half of the 19th century, capitalism gradually overcame feudalism on the European continent and found itself in an ascendant period of development. At that time, contradictions had already begun to occur within the capitalist system between production that was socialized and ownership that was private. The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie was already emerging. By the 1830's the proletariat had come on the stage as an independent political force and was becoming the greatest motive force in the development of history.

---

* Marx and Engels, "Circular Letter to A. Bebel and Others," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 374.

** Engels, "To F. A. Sorge (January 18, 1893)," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 498.

However, at that time the workers' movement lacked the guidance of revolutionary theory. Socially fashionable were spurious socialist doctrines and various utopian ideas such as Proudhonism, the Weitling doctrine, the "true socialism" of Germany, etc., representing the interests of feudalism, the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. Their common characteristic was opposition to class struggle. Everywhere they preached one could hear such fantasies as "immutable justice" and "the village filled with heavenly love." Advocates of these "isms" always saw themselves as "great men" and "saviors"; they said "there is no need to promote revolutionary action as a means of social transformation" and so forth.

When the followers of these various kinds of spurious socialism were running rampant through the workers' movement like an epidemic, Marx and Engels suddenly rose up like a new army and plunged into the struggle against the capitalist system and these reactionary trends of thought with the dauntless spirit of going against the tide. The Communist Manifesto was born! This brilliant work bluntly proclaimed: "The history of all society up to the present time has been a history of class struggle." The class struggle in capitalist society generally tends to show that "the fall of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable." "The communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."*

When the Communist Manifesto came off the press in February 1848, a revolutionary storm began to sweep over the European continent. The European revolution of 1848 enabled Marxism to receive its first baptism the moment it was born. Victoriously it survived the ordeal and underwent tremendous development, proving itself ever triumphant.

Marx and Engels formulated a line and strategy for the proletariat in this revolution according to their own doctrine of class struggle, to carry the bourgeois democratic revolution through to the end and, on the basis of achieving victory in the democratic revolution, to unhesitatingly proceed with the proletarian socialist revolution aimed at overthrowing the capitalist system. To hold to this line, Marx and Engels carried out sharp criticism against various opportunists, particularly against the French petty bourgeois socialist Louis Blanc who advocated the theory of class harmony.

The revolution of 1848 was a bourgeois democratic revolution. In France, the main task was to overthrow the July Monarchy under the monopoly rule of the financier bourgeoisie in order to prepare the way

---

* Marx and Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, pp. 250, 263, 285.

for industrial capitalism which was on the ascendancy. As for the proletariat, it should actively take part in the bourgeois democratic revolution and with thoroughgoing revolutionary spirit, strive for the victory in the democratic revolution to create conditions for moving on to the socialist revolution.

Louis Blanc also threw himself into the proletarian struggle against the July Monarchy. Although this man bragged about socialism, basically he was not a proletarian revolutionary, simply a fellow traveller in the proletarian struggle against the July Monarchy. What he preached for the workers was merely the stale goods of Proudhonism in disguise. What he wanted was to let the state establish "social factories" and "producers associations" and then to have the state assist these factories and associations with loans; in this way, private capitalist enterprise was to be squeezed into socialism, and so forth. With such honeyed words, he fraudulently gained the confidence of a part of the working masses.

In February 1848, the Parisian proletarians overthrew the rule of the July Monarchy in the course of a bloody battle and established the Second French Republic. The workers of Paris took Louis Blanc as their representative and sent him to serve in the Provisional Government which was organized after the revolution with bourgeois republicans as its mainstay. Due to the deceptive preaching of Louic Blanc's "socialism," the class consciousness of the worker masses was momentarily obscured; they harbored the illusion of gaining their own liberation within the framework of the bourgeois February republic and demanded that the Provisional Government safeguard the worker's right to work and solve the unemployment question in accordance with Louis Blanc's "prescription." This was to say they were bent on transforming the bourgeois republic into a "social republic" in line with Louis Blanc's doctrinaire and subjective thinking. This was the downright evil result of Louis Blanc's petty bourgeois socialism.

The bourgeois Provisional Government made full use of this issue. It announced the formation of a committee to handle the workers' problems, asking Louis Blanc to preside over it. In this activity, Louis Blanc did his utmost to render his services and wholly revealed himself to be a bourgeois agent within the workers' movement. On March 1, when the committee to handle the workers' problems was set up, Louic Blanc delivered a speech to the worker masses, in which he made a great show of the theory of class harmony, saying that "the principle we ought to strive for is unanimity in all walks of life....Yes, we want to safeguard the interests of the poor, which I need not repeat, but also we want to safeguard the interests of the rich, that is, the interests of every man." This clearly showed that when Louis Blanc, who previously served as a fellow traveller of the proletariat against the July Monarchy, came to the essential requirements for liberation of the proletariat itself, he used the viewpoint of class harmony to bind it hand and foot and did not let the proletariat make revolution.

Marx and Engels astutely observed that the committee chaired by Louic Blanc was no more than "a socialist temple to stand alongside the bank and exchange, next to the finance, commerce and public works departments," with Blanc as the "priest in charge." He was "assigned the task of discovering paradise, proclaiming a new gospel and giving the Parisian proletariat some work to do. Unlike the organs of political power in any mundane state, they had neither budget allotment nor administrative power. They used their own heads to beat against the pillars of bourgeois society."* This meant that Louis Blanc did not in the least want to touch the capitalist system; he merely used many honeyed words to spread an illusion of class harmony. Actually, the harmony that Louic Blanc wanted was in the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie; basically he did not oppose the bourgeois attack on the proletariat. Thus, when the Parisian proletariat, persecuted beyond endurance, rose up against the bourgeoisie in June 1848, it met with exceptionally severe suppression, with tens of thousands of workers falling into a bloodbath. The theory of class harmony did not bring the joy of winning liberation to the proletariat but cost a great many class brothers their heads instead.

Marx and Engels promptly summed up this historical lesson, pointing out that the proletariat's "desire to make even the slightest improvement in its own condition, within the framework of the bourgeois republic, is a utopian dream; such a utopia could become something criminal the moment efforts were made to make it come true. Therefore, if the proletariat is to compel the February Republic to fulfill the needs expected of it,.... it /the old slogan/ must be replaced with a bold new slogan of revolutionary struggle. This slogan is: Overthrow the bourgeoisie! Working class dictatorship!"**

This was the most profound summation of the history of the French Revolution of 1848 by Marx and Engels, a thoroughgoing criticism of the class harmony theory of Louis Blanc and his ilk. With this, Marx and Engels actually let people know that the contradictions and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were irreconcilable: "the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat."*** It was precisely this conclusion that distinguished Marxism from opportunism.

---

* Marx, "The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, p. 401.

** Ibid., p. 417.

*** Marx, "To J. Weydemeyer (March 5, 1852)," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 332.

One of the most important conclusions reached by Marx and Engels in summing up the experience of the European revolution of 1848 was "permanent revolution." And this "permanent revolution" "is the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations."* That is to say, throughout the whole of the long historical period until communism is realized, we must unremittingly persist in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and must never take the same road as people like Louis Blanc and his ilk.

II

With the defeat of the 1848 revolution, the European revolutionary movement entered low tide. However, the contradictions which failed to be resolved by the 1848 revolution still remained and new contradictions were constantly emerging besides. Therefore at that time Marx resolutely pointed out that a "new revolution was in the offing and just like a new crisis, it could not be avoided."** This was precisely the situation. Beginning with the late 1850's, just as expected, a new revolutionary high tide began to form. In every country of Europe and America the bourgeois national democratic movement was on the rise and the workers' movement was also gaining momentum. At the same time, opportunist factions within the workers' movement also came to the surface, constantly peddling their wares.

After Proudhon died in 1865, his mantle passed to his disciples who still stubbornly opposed Marxism and poisoned the workers' movement. In the late 1860's, the opportunist faction of Bakuninism also took shape and was fashionable for a time. In addition, a trade unionist faction emerged in the English workers' movement and played an extremely bad role.

In order to fight against these opportunist factions, Marx and Engels carried out a great many theoretical and practical activities and in 1864 established an independent proletarian political party--the First International. The struggle between Marxism and these opportunist schools of thought was still one which started with and centered on the basic question of whether or not to wage class struggle.

---

* Marx, "The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. I, pp. 479-480.

** Ibid., p. 488.

The Proudhonists had all along opposed the class struggle of the proletariat. They provoked a debate within the First International when they again wanted to impose their program of retreating to small private ownership on the international workers' movement.

In order to substitute their own opportunist program for the basic line formulated by Marx and Engels for the proletarian movement in the First International, the Proudhonists despicably turned to eclectic tactics to agitate for their theory of class harmony. They said no matter whether it is communism or the system of private ownership, "the things they aspire toward are good but the things they give rise to are bad." Therefore, we ought to strive for a "third form of social ownership," to have "a combination of public and private." This so-called Proudhonist "combination" was actually a pretext to safeguard private ownership and oppose public ownership; which side they leaned to was quite obvious. When they analyzed class relations, this reactionary viewpoint was more evident still. They said: "France is made up of three classes: (1) The bourgeoisie; (2) the middle class (the small bourgeoisie); (3) the proletariat. The objective of history, particularly the revolutionary objective, is to merge the two classes at the extremes -- the first and third -- with the second, that is, the one in the middle." Thus they invoked the method of class harmony to negate the contradictions and struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and clamored that the "two classes ought to cooperate and go hand in hand," to reach their objective of reversing the wheel of history. Therefore, Proudhinist eclecticism, which appeared impartial, was actually something to be used against the proletariat. No sooner did they touch on proletarian class struggle than they laid bare their true colors. They said: "As for the workers, strikes are illegal," "socially intolerable." They held it was only necessary to establish an exchange banks of some kind to provide interest-free loans for the small producers and then the proletariat could gain liberation. "There is no need to advocate revolutionary action as a means of social reform." In the final analysis, the Proudhonists would not allow proletarian revolution, the class struggle to be waged against the bourgeoisie.

Marx and Engels clearly pointed out the reactionary essence of Proudhonism: "Proudhonism is permeated throughout with a reactionary nature;"* in the workers' pockets there was not even six sou (old French coin worth one-twentieth of a franc--translator's note) and yet they wanted to make use of the workers' savings to buy a whole beautiful France!"** The Proudhon gang's plan to use this cheap swindle to negate class struggle

---

* Engels, "On the Housing Question," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. II, p. 479.

** "Engels to Marx" (September 18, 1846), Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXVII, p. 58.

was completely futile. Hitting the nail on the head, Marx observed that "on the eve of every overall transformation of society, the conclusion of the social scientist is always this: 'Fight or die; bloody war or annihilation. The question is sure to be formulated this way'."*

In 1866, the First Congress of the First International was convened in Geneva and the Marxists defeated the Proudhonists on a series of princpled questions; they also adopted the "common rules" drafted by Marx for the International and certain resolutions. Not only did the Proudhon gang suffer defeat on every important question but they were also split internally. Part of the group headed by Varlin began to lean toward the Marxists and formed a leftist bloc among the Proudhonists.

The Proudhonists learned nothing from the crushing defeat nor did they give ground on their reactionary stand and viewpoint. At the Second Congress of the First International in Lausanne, they waged a frenzied counter-attack to reverse the decisions of the Geneva Congress and revenge their defeat there. For a while, they stirred up trouble with bluster and clamor, even putting into the resolutions of the congress their doctrine -- "utilizing the credit the bourgeoisie and the government grant to the workers." However, the broad mass of workers supported Marxism and the Proudhonists became extremely isolated. By the time the Third Congress of the First International was convened in Brussels, the Proudhonists were thoroughly liquidated; the questions they had reversed were set right once more and a decision was adopted which, completely contrary to their doctrine, advocated public ownership of the means of production. This was a major victory in the struggle against Proudhonism and fulfilled Marx's preconceived plan: "Put these stupid asses, the Proudhonists, to death."**

No sooner had Marxism overcome Proudhonism than Bakunin, an opportunist element who sneaked into the First international, came forward. The Bakunians shouted a good many ultra-"Leftist" slogans, but the target of struggle they strove for, that is, their program, was still class harmony, as with opportunists everywhere. According to Bakunin, it was necessary to realize "equality among all classes in the political, economic and social aspects."

Severely criticizing Bakunin's opportunist program that substituted "class equality" for "abolition of classes," Marx observed that "taken literally, 'equality of classes' is no more than another way to speak of

---

* "The Poverty of Philosophy," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 198.

** Marx, "To Engels (September 11, 1867)," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXXI, p. 347.

harmony between capital and labor" as advocated by the bourgeois socialists. The ultimate objective which the International Worker Association must strive to achieve can only be "abolition of classes" which is historically inevitable, not "equality of classes" -- which is logically impossible."* With this, Marx drew a clear line of demarcation between his own doctrine and the opportunist fallacies of Bakunin. The goal of struggle for all true Marxists can only be the abolition of all classes. And to speak of "class equality" is in fact to give up class struggle by the oppressed classes.

Bakunin was an anarchist. He reversed the relationship between the superstructure and the economic base and saw the state as the source of all evils. Actually, his real purpose in opposing the state was by no means to "oppose slavery" as he claimed, but to oppose revolution and class struggle. The circumstances were very clear: "To want to abolish the state before realizing social transformation is ridiculous; abolition of capital is precisely a matter of social transformation, including the remolding of all forms of production."** It can be seen that Bakunin's anarchism was simply a camouflage used to oppose revolutionaries who stuck to the doctrine of class struggle. Marx and Engels penetratingly observed that: The Bakuninians "are a group wearing the mask of extreme anarchism, decidedly not to attack existing governments in all countries but to attack those revolutionaries who do not accept their doctrine and leadership."***

Owing to unrelenting exposure of Bakuninism by Marx and Engels and their ability to see through the various schemes perpetrated by Bakunin during the First International, they quickly won victory in the struggle against Bakuninism and at the Congress of the International held at The Hague in 1872, were able to expel the Bakuninians from the International.

During the struggle against Proudhonism and Bakuninism at the First International, a struggle was also waged against trade unionism. The so-called trade unionism was actually opportunism pushed through by the leadership of the British "National Trade Union Council." England in mid-19th century was the strongest capitalist state in the world, possessed the greatest number of colonies, had the most advanced industry and occupied a monopoly position in the world market. With a small part of the huge profits they had plundered, the English bourgeoisie bought over the upper

---

* Marx, "To Engels (March 5, 1869)," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXXII, p. 256.

** Engels, "To T. Cuno (January 24, 1872), Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. IV, p. 400.

*** Marx and Engels, "The Socialist Democratic League and the International Workers' Association," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XVIII, p. 371.

stratum of the working class and created a "worker aristocracy." The leaders of the trade unions were these self same "worker aristocrats."

Among the principal leaders of the trade unions were Ocher (奥哲尔), Kremer (克里默) and Hower (豪威尔). The slogan they issued for the trade unions was an out and out reformist slogan: "A day's fair work, a day's fair wage." Even the slightest shadow of class struggle couldn't be seen here. As trade union bureaucrats, they kept the worker masses under control by making use of the power they held and in line with the wishes of the bourgeoisie. They forbade the workers to strike, saying "we believe all strikes are a waste of money, not only for the workers but for the employers too." They led the trade union organizations to follow the ruling bourgeois Liberal Party of that time. In order to be of still better service to the Liberal Party during the reform of the English electoral system in 1867, they organized a nationwide "reform league," making the worker organizations appendages of the bourgeoisie. For this they were richly rewarded by the bourgeoisie. At that time the money to finance the "reform league" came from millionaire Molly (摩莱) in the knitting industry, Taylor (泰勒), boss of the Kuterd (库特尔德) Company, Solbert (索尔特), a big capitalist in the woollen industry. The heads of the trade unions even received special permission from the Liberal Party to participate in parliamentary elections in the party's name. This not only made it possible for them to enter parliament and gain special privileges but more importantly, enabled them to still more fully play their role as falcons of the propertied class. In short, the leaders of the trade unions became officials in the worker organizations, seized power and received rewards from the bourgeoisie; they turned to a bourgeois life of ease and luxury. They divorced themselves from the working masses, betrayed the interests of the working class and came to look on class struggle as a threat to their comfortable life style; as a result, not only did they cease to make revolution themselves, but they also used their power and authority to prevent the workers from making revolution.

Marx and Engels made the most profound criticism of the English trade unions. They clearly pointed out that all trade unionists were flunkies in the employ of the bourgeoisie. "Not only are the employers very satisfied with them, but they too are very satisfied with the employers."* Engels particularly observed that trade unionists "advocate to the workers a kind of socialism which rises above the class interests of the workers and class struggle and which seeks to harmonize the interests of two opposing classes into something higher in humanity."**

---

* Engels, "The Condition of the Working Class in England, preface to the 1892 English edition," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXII, p. 321.

** Engels, "The Condition of the Working Class in England, preface to the American edition," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXI, p. 297.

This analysis by Marx and Engels completely unmasked the essence of not only trade unionism but also of opportunism of every description. Opportunists are bourgeois elements within the worker ranks, scabs and traitors in the workers' movement who use the power they usurp to champion the interests of the bourgeoisie. The line they impose on the workers' movement is one that rises above class struggle, that is, a line of basically rejecting class struggle and promoting reconciliation between classes, in essence capitulating to the bourgeoisie.

III

The principles of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship as expounded by Marx and Engels in the course of their struggle against various kinds of opportunism were further demonstrated and developed in the revolutionary practice of the Paris Commune. When Marx summed up the experience of the Paris Commune, he came to the following famous conclusion: "The working class must not simply get hold of the ready-made state machine and use it to achieve its own goals."* That is to say, the proletariat ought to use revolutionary means to seize state power, smash the old state machine of the bourgeoisie and substitute proletarian dictatorship for bourgeois dictatorship. This is precisely the main principle of the Paris Commune. It is the watershed between Marxism and opportunism.

The first major crossing of swords in the struggle between Marxism and opportunism after the Paris Commune was over the criticism of the German Social Democratic Party's "Gotha Program," which was released in 1875 and replete with the opportunist viewpoints of Lassalle. Professing himself to be a "working class leader" and "socialist authoritative theoretician," Lassalle was in fact merely a bourgeois democratic element. He had taken part in the bourgeois democratic revolution in 1848. In the early 1860's, when the German workers' movement was gaining momentum, he sneaked into the ranks of the working class by plagiarizing Marxist texts and held the leadership position in the All-German Workers' Federation. At this time not only did he not move over to the side of the working class, but on the contrary, his close personal relationship with Bismarck of the Kingdom of Prussia made him a capitulationist in the workers' movement, where he energetically peddled opportunist goods, advocated class harmony and opposed proletarian revolution. He claimed that to rely on Prussia's "state assistance" to establish cooperatives was the "most peaceful, most legal and simplest way" for the workers to attain economic liberation. According to him, the sole means for achieving this was to acquire "universal direct suffrage." Therefore, the class struggle and revolution of the proletariat could be completely dispensed with. He also distorted the class nature of the state, opposed proletarian dictatorship and urged that a "free people's state" be established, saying "the mission of the state lies in developing liberty, enabling mankind to develop in the direction of liberty," and so on and so forth.

---

* Marx, "The Civil War in France," in book form, p. 52.

After Lassalle's inglorious death in 1864, his successors, Schweitzer and the like, continued to drivel all his fallacies. These disciples of Lassalle made use of the mistakes made by W. Liebknecht and others in abandoning revolutionary principles on the question of merging the two factions, and forced Lassalle's many fallacies into the German Party's program -- the "Gotha Program."

Marx and Engels carried out comprehensive and thoroughgoing criticism of the "Gotha Program," and their clear reckoning of Lassalle's opportunism and criticism of the serious errors of the German party's leadership greatly enriched the theoretical treasure house of Marxism.

It was still in the 1860's that Marx and Engels had already pointed to Lassalle as a capitulationist: "Lassalle's overall socialism lies in cursing and reviling the capitalists while fawning upon the backward Prussian Junkers."* They repeatedly taught the German proletariat that they could not relax their class struggle and particularly observed that "direct universal suffrage," as advocated by the Lassalleans, "isn't a weapon but a pitfall for the proletariat."** And when criticizing the "Gotha Program," Marx and Engels once more stressed that the most fundamental principle of a proletarian political party was to uphold class struggle. They reproved the Lassalleans for casting aside class struggle and demanding in a country of military dictatorship such as Germany "things that have relevance only in a democratic republic," the achievement of which, moreover, was to be guaranteed by legal procedure. This was purely "shopworn democratic nonsense known to all." Marx and Engels further explained that even in a democratic republic one must not forget that the "ultimate battle of class struggle has to be fought." After the proletariat seizes political power, there must also be a "period of revolutionary transition" from capitalist society to socialist society; "the state in this period can only be a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."*** This clearly stated that the German party, in achieving both its own program of democratic revolution and a socialist, communist program, could only arrive at its goal by relying on class struggle. The fatal flaw in Lassalleanism was in fact the betrayal of class struggle and proletarian dictatorship. When Marx criticized the "Gotha Program,"

---

* Engels, "Book Review on Capital by K. Marx, Vol. 1," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XVI, pp. 255-256.

** Engels, "The Military Question of Prussia and the German Workers Political Party," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XVI, p. 83.

*** The above quotes are from "Critique of the Gotha Program," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 21.

he set forth the famous principle that revolutionaries "must never barter away principles,"* which means that they must never turn their backs on class struggle and proletarian dictatorship.

IV

In 1878, Bismarck, representative of the German landlord-bourgeois class, stepped up white terror by promulgating the reactionary, anti-socialist "emergency laws" in order to suppress both the workers' movement and the socialist movement. At this time, opportunist elements within the party, yielding to the high-handed policy of the reactionary government, stirred up an evil wind of Right capitulation. The main representatives of this evil wind were Hochberg and Schramn, editors of the party newspaper in Zurich at the time, and Bernstein, Hochberg's secretary and patron saint of revisionism. In their Social Science and Social Politics Yearbook, they published an article entitled "A Review of the German Socialist Movement," vainly trying to tamper with the party's line and change the nature of the party, thereby provoking a full-scale debate. To hit back at this challenge from the opportunists, Marx and Engels wrote a famous "Circular Letter" for the leaders of the German party. It was in this letter that Marx and Engels solemnly declared: "We certainly cannot take the same road as those who want to abolish class struggle from the movement."

These three opportunist elements, labeled the "Zurich Trio" by Marx and Engels, did their utmost to basically transform the party's nature and line, saying that there should be a "movement led by independent men of science and by all people rich in the genuine spirit of benevolence and love" and that the party also should "have many of its supporters from among the educated and propertied classes." This meant that the party ought to forsake its proletarian character and even meekly turn its leadership of the revolutionary cause over to those "men of science." This is typical capitulation. Also, one week before the "Circular Letter" was issued, Engels rebutted Hochberg to his face, saying: "We could never have thought it possible to repudiate the proletarian banner we have held high over the past nearly 40 years, let alone approving the double talk about fraternity from the petty bourgeoisie against whom we have fought also for nearly 40 years."** In the "Circular Letter" Marx and Engels once again noted that the "Zurich Trio" "want to use their official positions to oppose the proletarian nature of the party."

---

* Marx, "To W. Blacke (May 5, 1875)," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 4.

** Engels, "To J. F. Becker (September 15, 1879)," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXXIV, p. 367.

This extremely profound analysis by Marx and Engels really spoke to the "Trio's" essence: They are people who conduct their activities by "making use of their official positions," possess definite powers within the workers' political party, but who are anti-party elements whose actions represent the bourgeoisie; they are the bourgeoisie within the party. Precisely because they have power, they are far more dangerous. Marx and Engels had previously pointed out that: "What they hanker after are bourgeois things, not proletarian things."* In a word, they are "people who want to transform the party in their own image."**

When the "trio" used the bourgeois stand and world outlook to transform the party, they dished out a typical opportunist line, and said, we didn't want to "abandon our party and program, but we hold that if we use all our strength and energy to achieve some of our most recent goals, goals we must achieve before we begin to consider more distant tasks, then there will be work enough for many years to come."

The views of the "trio" are quite clear: It is no longer necessary to stress what the basic program is; we need only to implement the "most recent goals" and there "will be work enough for many years to come." This is betrayal of communism, an out and out capitulationist program which basically rejects the proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship. Sidestepping class struggle and the great goals of communism and using "all our strength" and "all our energy" to achieve "the most recent goals" is to place all activities of the proletariat within the framework of bourgeois sanction. Marx and Engels acutely observed that this was nothing but "pitiable patchwork to the capitalst system;' its objective was to "consolidate the old social system."

This struggle waged by Marx and Engels to hit back at Right capitulationism scored a great victory. In the course of struggle, the German party and the German workers' movement underwent great development and testified to the wise judgment written in the "Circular Letter" by Marx and Engels: "These people want to confine history to their own narrow and philistine vision, but history always passes them by and takes its own course."

In the nearly 40 years prior to 1879, the breathtaking struggle waged by Marx and Engels against those opportunists who vainly tried to abolish class struggle demonstrated that in a society where classes exist, class struggle will always be the motive force that promotes historical

---

* Engels, "To F. A. Sorge (September 19, 1879), Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXXIV, p. 399.

** "Marx to Engels (August 1, 1877)," Complete Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. XXXIV, p. 360.

development. The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is reflected within the proletarian political party in the form of a fierce two-line struggle. Those who stick to the opportunist line always turn into bourgeois agents within the Party; their common characteristic is their vain effort to abolish class struggle. Such is the case under conditions of bourgeois rule, and after the proletariat seizes political power this characteristic is still more strikingly manifested. Most recently, Chairman Mao pointed out: "You are making the socialist revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeoisie is. It is right in the Communist Party -- those in power taking the capitalist road. The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road."

"The capitalist roaders are still on the capitalist road." This is a problem that will exist throughout the whole of the socialist historical period. Let us remember Chairman Mao's great teaching, persist in taking class struggle as the key link, resolutely refraim from taking the same road as those who abandon class struggle, and thus history will "bypass" the capitalist roaders who are still on the capitalist road and "take its own course."

* * *

Historical Research, No. 2, April 20, 1976

Table of Contents

Resolution of Central Committee of Communist Party of China on Appointment of Comrade Hua Kuo-feng To Be the First Vice Chairman of Central Committee of Communist Party of China and Premier of State Council of People's Republic of China — SPRCM No. 871

Resolution of Central Committee of Communist Party of China on Dismissing Teng Hsiao-p'ing from All Posts Both Inside and Outside the Party — SPRCM No. 871

Class Struggle Is the Key Link, Everything Else Hinges on It - by Chin Nan — SPRCM No. 878

We Certainly Cannot Take the Same Road as Those Who Try To Abolish Class Struggle — SPRCM No. 896

The Bankruptcy of the Theory of Productive Forces as Seen from the History of Agricultural Cooperativization in Our Country - by Shih Wei — SPRCM No. 875

A Brand New Socialist University -- A brief history of Chaoyang Agricultural College — SPRCM No. 874

Confucius Was a Conspirator - by Li Ssu-yen

The Doctrine of the Golden Means and Eclecticism - by Yang Hsien-pang

"Trouble Caused by Law" or "Trouble Caused by Pursuit of Material Things"? -- Notes on reading the silk book Lao Tzu - by Li Ping

"The Rule of Wen and Ching" -- a Definition - by K'ang Min — SPRCM No. 878

Struggle against Capitulationism and Separatism in the Late T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo Period — SPRCM No. 883

How Did the Chinese Bourgeoisie Rise to Power? - by Chu Kuang-hsi

Lies Cannot Change History -- In refutation of the shameless lies of the Soviet revisionists tampering with the history of the Dzungar SPRCM No. 885

The Ch'ing Government's Struggle To Quell Dzungar Rebellions and Resist Tsarist Russian Aggression
- by Ch'ing Ssu SPRCM No. 885

"Masterpiece" of Hegemonism -- Comment on China's Modern History
- by Wu Yin-nien SPRCM No. 878

Forum on China's Ancient History:

The 7th Lecture Continued Development of Feudal Society and Further Formation of a United, Multi-national Country -- Sung, Liao, Chin and Yüan

- by Workers Theoretical Study Group of Shanghai No. 5 Steel Mill

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

U.S.MAIL

CMP X761231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680